

were not complete and could not be commissioned. The copper was in stock—plenty of it. Applications for priority had been made weeks ago. Red tape in W. P. B. delayed or refused it. These boats should be out on our Pacific coast so as to give space for new ones being constructed. This is neither economy nor common sense. It is just plain bureaucratic dumbheadedness and inefficiency. The war cannot be won in this manner. Food from our farms and materials for clothing are just as necessary as war implements. The people back home know this and insist on it—swivel-chair bureaucrats and brass hats back here in Washington, D. C., to the contrary notwithstanding. Not only are the people of this country awake to the serious situation, but they are just as loyal and patriotic—even more so—than those drawing down a fat salary. They have been buying bonds and stamps; they have been willing to pay heavy taxes; they are willing to sacrifice. But they insist that the funds appropriated and taxes levied be used in an all-out effort to win this war and not wasted as it is now too evidently done. The upsurge of the voters was a healthy sign of live democracy. For my part I was glad to see it. This, too, notwithstanding my personal defeat. Personalities, after all, are really secondary. Unless those in authority heed this warning and rectify these unsound and undemocratic practices immediately there will be a more serious and decided revolt in 1944. The people of the United States are sound at heart. Jefferson trusted them. Lincoln trusted them. Why should not we who proclaim these two as our heroes, also trust them? We can and will win this war, but it will be won by the rank and file in these United States and not by bureaucrats and visionaries here in Washington, D. C. Again permit me to say: Not only do I abide by the verdict of the voters back home, but I will continue to do my very best to help in correcting the political, economic, and social evils too prevalent in our beloved America. This is the duty and privilege of a private citizen the same as of a public servant.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 10 days, on account of important business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 12, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 7776. A bill relating to deferment of registrants regularly engaged in fishing essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 7777. A bill to allow payments in lieu of taxes on property taken by the United States Government; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1942

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of Mercies, in Thee we live; away from Thee we perish. Thou only canst redeem our life from destruction.

As we witness man's inhumanity to man, we confess with sorrow that human devices and designs have deceived and betrayed every fair hope and brought ashes for beauty; the arm of flesh has failed us. Man has forsaken Thy ways all holy and slighted Thy word. Thou hast given him the faculty of creating beauty, and he has used the gifts of Thy grace to destroy the works of his own hands and the heritage of his children. In these latter days Thou hast granted him the dominion of the air, and he uses his wings to rain death and destruction upon the good earth, tearing to tatters the fair fabric of his own achievements.

By Thy mercy and by Thy judgments hasten the day when the devotion, the skill, and the knowledge of men shall channel broad streams of living waters of good will through the arid wastes of human need and in wildernesses blossoming as rose gardens shall plant trees of life abundant, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. So out of the wrath of man may there come the reign of God, whose alone is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 9, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5458. An act to amend the Organic Act of Alaska; and

H. R. 7528. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5458) to amend the Organic Act of Alaska, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LOUIS E. GOODMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has before it the nomination of Louis E. Goodman, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, I give notice, under the rule of the committee, that there will be a public hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room a week from today, Thursday, November 19, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., at which time and place all persons interested may be heard.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Barkley	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Herring	Rosier
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Brown	Kilgore	Taft
Bulow	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Murdoch	Wiley
Doxey	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

# REPORT OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

## To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fifth Report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940, and ending June 30, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 12, 1942.

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from Mrs. M. H. Wilson, general delivery, Washington, D. C., in regard to the interpretation and administration of the laws relating to alien enemies and alien property by certain courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Missouri; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

### "House Resolution 11

"Whereas since the adjournment of the regular session of the Sixty-first General Assembly of the State of Missouri, and on December 7, 1941, Japan made a sneak assault upon citizens and possessions of the United States of America at Pearl Harbor; and

"Whereas on December 8, 1941, a state of war was formally declared; and

"Whereas since said 8th day of December 1941 the United States Government and the people of this Nation have been working together for an all-out war and an early victorious conclusion; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, has done each, all, and everything necessary to this time for the preservation of our democracy, our possessions, and the safety and welfare of our citizenship; and

"Whereas among other foresighted and important things done and accomplished, the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has appointed a native son of Hannibal, Mo., Donald M. Nelson, to the position of Chairman of the War Production Board, which office and appointment is one vital to the prosecution and early conclusion of this war; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Donald M. Nelson have worked in full and complete unison and harmony for the advancement and progress of the United States of America in our war efforts; and

"Whereas many thousands of Missouri manhood, the cream of our citizenship, are now in the various branches of military service of their country; and

"Whereas many thousands more of our citizenship are engaged in defense employment; and

"Whereas the rest of the population of the State of Missouri are in full and complete unison, harmony, and accord with the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the prosecution of the war effort and with his administration, and each and all things done by him in the furtherance thereof; and

"Whereas in World War No. 1, the citizenship of Missouri distinguished themselves in the service of their country, and especially such men as Rear Admiral Coontz, of Hannibal; Rear Admiral Willard, of Kirksville; General Crowder, of Trenton; and General Pershing, of Linn County; and

"Whereas the history of the United States has repeated itself in that in our present time of great trial God Almighty has again presented to the people of this Nation a great leader to guide and direct our course and destiny: So, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first General Assembly of the State of Missouri, in extra session assembled, That the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, be commended in each, all, and everything he has done as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the armed forces in the prosecution of this war and in the orderly and far-sighted judgment used in all things in connection with the war effort, and especially commending him in the selection of Donald M. Nelson as Chairman of the War Production Board, and that the people of the State of Missouri, by and through their representatives in the sixty-first general assembly, in extraordinary session assembled, hereby and by this resolution commend the President of the United States of America, and hereby reaffirm our faith and confidence in the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt; Donald M. Nelson; and the President's administration, in their ability, good judgment, and tireless effort for and on behalf of all these United States, their possessions, their people, and their welfare, and this House of Representatives of the Sixty-first General Assembly of Missouri, in extraordinary session assembled, collectively and individually bind ourselves to cooperate with the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and all the various agencies, civil and military, in an all-out effort for an early and conclusive victory: Be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to Donald M. Nelson, and to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and that a copy hereof be spread upon the permanent records of this house."

### By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of members of the congregation of the Rosedale Baptist Church, Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

## LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS FROM DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a letter which I have received from Mr. William P. Dibble, adjutant of the department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, together with copy of resolutions adopted by a meeting of the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held

at Thomaston, Conn., on October 25, 1942.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

#### OF THE UNITED STATES,

#### DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT, INC.,

Meriden, Conn., October 31, 1942.

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,

United States Senate,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As the phraseology of the attached resolution bears out our feelings on the matter, we feel, Senator, and pray that you and your colleagues will do nothing to disturb the present basis of benefits to our comrades of World War No. 1, and that you have all been sincere in the enactment of amendments to the World War Compensation Act for our comrades of World War No. 2.

The present system has proven itself to be the best and most equal basis that we have had, and seems to me to carry out the wishes of the illustrious men who have gone before, who had a feeling for the disabled man. To meddle with a just arrangement is going to cause hardships on end, and the man who should be taken care of is going to suffer, just as was the case not so many years ago. This can best be said in the immortal words of the great Lincoln: "To care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and orphans." This never intended to have war veterans in need of special care to be classed as civilians. We want to keep what we have, Senator, and give to those that are now fighting our fight, everything that we can. If this is what might be called a special class, then let us have a special class, for without the efforts of these lads, we will have no class.

We pray, Senator, that you will give our resolution the consideration which we believe it merits, and that you will work for the ultimate defeat of H. R. 7484 and the immediate passage of S. 2827; we are not asking for more, we are asking for a continuance of the same treatment that is in force, and the Divine Providence knows they are worthy of this from a grateful Government.

Realizing the many problems that are yours in a time like this, but also realizing that you have been most square on problems that have confronted you regarding veteran legislation, we know that you will take time out on this and again act as you have in the past, for the best interests of your comrades and mine.

Thanking you again for the many favors which you have shown me, and with my best wishes for continued strength to meet the problems of all our people at a time like this, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BILL DIBBLE,  
Department Adjutant.

At a regular meeting of the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Thomaston, Conn., on Sunday, October 25, 1942, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas, it has come to the attention of this Department that by H. R. 7484, it is proposed to place the administration of Veterans Affairs in the control of the Federal Security Commission, and which bill would deprive veterans of past wars, of benefits under existing laws, and the existing system of care for disabled veterans, which have proven satisfactory in the past, and that S. 2827, also pending, proposes to continue those benefits as they are now administered: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this department, That we most earnestly urge the defeat of said H. R. 7484, and the passage of S. 2827, to continue to present war veterans and those who shall



become disabled by reason of their sacrifice to perpetuate our freedom in the present war against our national existence and American principles of liberty."

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter I have received from Herbert Brown, Rugby, N. Dak., respecting the prevention of liquor sales and the suppression of vice around Army camps.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUGBY, N. DAK.

To the Congress of the United States:

HONORED GENTLEMEN: I humbly beg your permission to present the following statement.

It is my opinion that Senate bill 860, to prohibit vice (prostitution and red-light districts) and liquor in and around Army camps or some other bill with equal restrictions should be enacted into law immediately.

My reason for believing that such legislative action should be taken is as follows:

First, because we need the greatest efficiency in the prosecution of this war.

Secondly, because carefully made scientific tests have proven that the use of alcoholic liquor in any degree as a beverage retards the muscular and visual reactions of the person using liquor containing alcohol, thus lessening the efficiency of the person who uses it.

Third, because in lowering the draft age of our young men to 18 and 19 years we are placing mere boys in our armed forces and subjecting them to the influences of camp life at a period of their lives when that influence needs to be as wholesome and productive of physical and moral and spiritual strength as is possible.

And lastly, in inducting these young men into our armed forces we are asking them to give a number of years of their lives, and, if need be to give life itself, as many will do, in the waging of a war for which they are not responsible and under conditions more terrible than have ever existed before. We are asking them to die for a great cause and liquor and vice are the enemies of that faith which prepares men to die.

Respectfully submitted.

HERBERT BROWN.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I present and ask consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD at this juncture as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred several letters I have received from a pastor of various churches in a section of Virginia in reference to Senate bill 860 and the so-called Lee amendment.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing you, not personally, but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

At a very representative service at Beach Grove Methodist Church, Spotsylvania County, Va., Sunday, October 25, 1942, the congregation requested the pastors present to write to you, stating that the congregation desires the passage of protective legislation for our armed forces from the liquor and vice traffics similar to that which was enacted by Congress in 1917.

Furthermore, the congregation urges you, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to insist that Senate bill No. 860 be taken from the calendar, and be brought before the Senate for careful consideration and for a vote by the Senate. Fair play demands that such procedure be followed, so that a roll call of the Senate may be had on the merits of the present bill, or upon the bill as amended for more effective protection.

You are requested to read this action of the congregation upon the floor of the Senate, and to ask that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

C. L. STILLWELL,  
Pastor, Spotsylvania Charge,  
Spotsylvania, Va.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing you, not personally but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

At a very representative service at Tabernacle Methodist Church, Spotsylvania County, Va., Sunday, October 25, 1942, the congregation requested the pastors present to write to you, stating that the congregation desires the passage of protective legislation for our armed forces from the liquor and vice traffics similar to that which was enacted by Congress in 1917.

Furthermore, the congregation urges you, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to insist that Senate bill No. 860 be taken from the calendar, and be brought before the Senate for careful consideration and for a vote by the Senate. Fair play demands that such procedure be followed, so that a roll call of the Senate may be had on the merits of the present bill, or upon the bill as amended for more effective protection.

You are requested to read this action of the congregation upon the floor of the Senate, and to ask that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

C. L. STILLWELL,  
Pastor, Spotsylvania Charge,  
Spotsylvania, Va.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing you, not personally, but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

At a very representative service at Zion Methodist Church, Spotsylvania County, Sunday October 25, 1942, the congregation requested the pastors present to write to you, stating that the congregation desires the passage of protective legislation for our armed forces from the liquor and vice traffic similar to that which was enacted by Congress in 1917.

Furthermore, the congregation urges you, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to insist that Senate bill No. 860 be taken from the calendar, and be brought before the Senate for careful consideration and for a vote by the Senate. Fair play demands that such procedure be followed, so that a roll call of the Senate may be had on the merits of the present bill, or upon the bill as amended for more effective protection.

You are requested to read this action of the congregation upon the floor of the Senate, and to ask that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

C. L. STILLWELL,  
Pastor, Spotsylvania Charge,  
Spotsylvania, Va.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2788. A bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1672).

By Mr. GERRY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 7575. A bill to expedite the prosecution of war, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1673).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2890. A bill for the relief of Robert Paul Horst; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2891. A bill to amend paragraph 8, section 127a of the National Defense Act so to authorize certain service to be counted in determining precedence among officers when dates of rank are the same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alethea Arthur;

S. 2893. A bill for the relief of F. M. Maloy; and

S. 2894. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2895. A bill for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. REYNOLDS also introduced Senate bill 2896, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT TO AMERICAN WAR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, American war correspondents are shattering all precedents and traditions in this war by sharing the dangers of front-line troops. Several have been killed in action; others are missing in action; yet more have been wounded in action.

Contrary to all previous wars, American war correspondents in this war are serving on battleships, aircraft carriers, destroyers; they fly into enemy territory in bombers and fighting aircraft; they ride beyond the front lines in tanks and armored cars; they go far beyond the front trenches, because trench warfare is only a phase and not always an important phase in modern warfare.

Despite all their hazards, these men are ineligible for war-risk insurance. They are likewise denied commercial insurance because of the excessive premiums required where such insurance is even offered them. Because they are, first, subject to military law and are under the control of the commander of the Army force—or Navy force—which they accompany; second, are treated as prisoners of war when captured by the enemy; third, subject to the Articles of War and all regulations for the government of the Army—or Navy—pursuant to war; fourth, are compelled to waive all claims against the United States for losses, damages, or injuries which may be suffered as a result of accompanying troops; fifth, compelled to wear military uniforms, even though wearing a uniform may endanger his life; sixth, unable to quit their posts without the writ-

ten permission of his commander, these men should be made eligible for war-risk insurance while on assignment with the armed forces of the United States.

Every day war correspondents for the American press associations and newspapers are risking their lives. Only last Saturday, November 7, two American correspondents were wounded in Egypt—Alexander C. Sedgwick, of the New York Times, and Jack Lait, of International News Service.

The honor roll of war correspondents includes Jack Singer, of International News Service, killed in the loss of the *Lexington*; Witt Hancock, of the Associated Press; and H. L. Percy and William McDougal, of the United Press, lost in Java and Africa. There are many more.

These boys risk their lives while serving with the Army or Navy, and it is only fitting that they be made eligible to war-risk insurance.

In connection with these remarks, I introduce a bill relative to the extension of the privilege which I have been discussing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Carolina will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2896) extending the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to American war correspondents was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### DEPENDENTS OF FRANK EDWARD DACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL (for Mr. DOWNEY) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. DOWNEY to the bill (S. 2859) for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### SENATE ELECTIONS AND THE POLL TAX

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short statement which was submitted in evidence before the Senate Special Committee on the Poll Tax showing the 48 States, in descending order by percentage of potential voting population, voting in the 1940 and the 1936 senatorial elections.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### SENATE ELECTIONS AND THE POLL TAX

One vote for Senator in a poll-tax State is worth more than 3 votes in a non-poll-tax State. In my State of Kansas, for example, about 68 percent of the potential voting population votes in Senate elections. In the poll-tax State of Alabama, 18 percent of the potential voting population votes.

In the senatorial elections of 1940 and 1936 there was no State among the 8 which maintain the poll-tax restriction of the suffrage—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—in which as many as 29 percent of the potential voting population voted. In the 40 non-poll-tax States, 67 percent of the potential voting population voted. In Indiana, Illinois, Utah, Idaho, West Virginia, Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York, more than 75 percent of the potential voters voted. Of all of the non-poll-tax States only in the 3 which have only recently abolished the poll tax—North Carolina, Florida, and

Louisiana—was the vote less than 49 percent of the potential voting population.

The following chart, which was submitted in evidence before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Poll Tax, shows the 48 States in descending order by percent of potential voting population voting in the 1940 and 1936 senatorial elections:

*Senate elections showing States in descending order by percent of potential voting population voting, 1940 and 1936*

West Virginia.....	84
Utah.....	83
Illinois, Indiana.....	80
Connecticut, Delaware.....	78
Massachusetts, New York, Idaho.....	77
Nevada, Missouri, North Dakota, Rhode Island.....	74
Nebraska.....	73
New Jersey, Colorado.....	72
South Dakota.....	71
Montana, Minnesota.....	70
Ohio, Wisconsin.....	69
Kansas.....	68
Iowa, Washington, New Mexico.....	67
Vermont, Pennsylvania.....	66
Michigan.....	64
California.....	61
Oregon.....	60
Kentucky.....	59
Maine, New Hampshire.....	57
Arizona.....	54
Maryland.....	53
Oklahoma.....	49
North Carolina.....	43
Texas.....	28
Florida.....	27
Tennessee, Louisiana.....	24
Virginia.....	19
Alabama.....	18
Georgia, Arkansas.....	15
Mississippi, South Carolina.....	12

Figures for 1936 used only for those States which held no senatorial elections in 1940.

#### WAR TAXES AND WAR BONDS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, last Monday I made a brief statement regarding war taxes and War bonds, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I seriously doubt whether taxes should again be increased in 1943, as the Treasury seems to contemplate. The country should have a year in which to adjust itself to the latest tax bill. These new taxes already approach the danger line so far as ordinary corporate existence is concerned just as they also drive close to the subsistence line for millions of our people. It seems to me that the prime consideration now to be borne in mind is that our major fiscal problem, in respect to the war, is that of successfully financing the enormous and inevitable deficits which will be left after every possible dollar of new tax revenue has been collected. For example, after this last tax bill raises eight billions of new revenue, there still remains a deficit of fifty billions for this same fiscal year. Next year's deficit will be substantially larger.

Adequate and prudent methods for the Nation-wide absorption of these bonds on a noninflationary basis is our next great problem. It involves 10 times as much money as could possibly be squeezed out of the American hide in the form of new taxes superimposed upon those already voted. Certainly it requires the maintenance of American business as a going concern to carry this load, and we are already warned by the War Production Board that we have already gone to the tax limit for sustaining a healthy national economy. Certainly it requires us to leave the individual taxpayer with some sort of a margin with which to face these other

unavoidable responsibilities. We must avoid that last straw which breaks the camel's back. In other words, the additional collection of another and final three or four billions in further taxes is far less important than the Nation-wide absorption of forty or fifty billions in bonds, particularly if the former jeopardizes the latter.

As I see it, the next problem is a bond problem and not a tax problem, except as a further tax bill confines itself to stopping further loopholes and to correcting inequities and to improving administrative methods through larger collection at the source and to implementing the so-called Ruml plan for putting tax liabilities on a current basis. What we now need, and what we cannot escape is a practical program for the Nation-wide distribution—as far as possible in the hands of private investors—of at least five times as many War bonds as are now being subscribed. The unliquidated problem is not more taxes but more bonds.

#### VOLUNTEERS FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE TRUCK OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief article from the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader telling of the volunteering within 24 hours of 27 men as drivers, mechanics, and dispatchers to serve as members of 1 of the 2 truck regiments organized by the American Trucking Associations for immediate service overseas on a vital mission. The article demonstrates that the spirit which animated the patriots at Lexington and Concord is still alive in the hearts of the men of New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ENLIST 27 NEW HAMPSHIRE TRUCK DRIVERS FOR VITAL OVERSEAS MISSION

The war council of the New Hampshire Truck Owners' Association recruited within 24 hours a total of 27 drivers, mechanics, and dispatchers throughout the State to serve as members of 1 of the 2 truck regiments organized by the American Trucking Associations for immediate service overseas on a vital mission.

Immediately after being notified by the national association that the Army had called for volunteers, the State organization communicated with all sections of the State and within a day had raised the quota set for New Hampshire, according to A. J. Staby, secretary and general manager in New Hampshire.

The State men will be activated about November 20.

#### OVER 4,000 VOLUNTEER

Immediately following the national association's announcement of the drive, more than 4,000 volunteers were listed.

The New Hampshire list was gathered by the war council committee of four—Dana L. Clark, of Nashua; J. E. Faltin, of Aime V. Plante, and Clark Jones, all of Manchester. Vernice W. Law, of Nashua, is president of the State association.

The Granite State volunteers are:

Ralph D. Bailey, Manchester; Euripides Koyladen, Goffs Falls; Vaughn Goss, Manchester; Louis N. Cote, Nashua; Lionel Theriault, Nashua; James V. Cochrane, Antrim; Henry Woods, Epping; Edmund J. Schneider, Rochester; John Byrnes, Somerville; Maurice Smith, Lisbon; Clifton Dexter, Lisbon; Charles Carpenter, Littleton.



Wilfred Dumont, Haverhill; Stanley Payne, Keene; Frederic Beauchesne, Keene; John Fountain, West Swanzey; George W. Gowen, Portsmouth; Silvio Cote, Nashua; Edias D. Benoit, Manchester; Walton Easton, East Rochester; John McKenna, Dover; John L. Butkiewicz, Claremont; Donald G. Worden, Goffstown; Harold W. Parker, Manchester; Funnell Wallace, Rochester; Richard Crosby, Laconia; and Charles Lowell, Laconia.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the executive committee in charge of the reorganization of the Missouri Pacific Railroad, which has real bearing on the reorganization of that great railroad system. I should like to have the letter printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD Co.,  
New York, N. Y., October 23, 1942.  
The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
United States Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: On the floor of the Senate earlier this month, you and Senator WHEELER referred to interference in the plan of reorganization of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. There is interference in that reorganization. It threatens consequences of much greater gravity and national consequences than those mentioned by you or Senator WHEELER. That interference, however, is not the interference of any speculators (for whom I have no sympathy) but is interference by a closely knit group of financial institutions—life-insurance companies and banks—who are seeking to obtain control of the reorganized Missouri Pacific and in so doing threaten:

(1) To withhold many millions of dollars in cash which should immediately be paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in liquidation of debt, thereby becoming available to the furtherance of the war program; and

(2) By an ingenious utilization of current rail reorganization procedure, to acquire control of a number of now competitive major rail systems in the hands of this same closely knit group of financial institutions; and

(3) A large-scale destruction of bona fide investment values in rail securities without financial justification.

I am sure that you would not wish misimpressions on a matter of such national importance to remain in the minds of your associates in the Senate either as a result of remarks made or omissions to state material facts pertinent to the reorganization of this railroad. Accordingly, I respectfully invite your attention to the salient facts of the situation.

1. The interference in the Missouri Pacific reorganization of a group of life-insurance companies and banks threatens to withhold many millions of dollars which should immediately be paid to the United States Government in liquidation of debt.

A closely knit group of life-insurance companies and banks is effectively obstructing the accomplishment of a number of constructive steps proposed in the Missouri Pacific reorganization, unnecessarily prolonging the reorganization of that railroad.

A glaring (and current) example is this: On October 30, 1942, we will move before Judge George H. Moore of the United States district court in St. Louis, that the trustee of the Missouri Pacific be directed to pay in full the principal of a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan of \$23,134,800, together with certain interest. There is now in the custody

of Mr. Guy Thompson, trustee of the road, the extravagantly huge cash balance of nearly \$70,000,000, while the interest continues to accumulate on the railroad's bank loans, Railroad Credit Corporation advances, Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan, and the like, to the detriment of the estate. If this Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan were paid off, the United States Government would immediately receive something in the neighborhood of \$28,000,000 cash which could obviously promptly be put to use, directly or indirectly, in furtherance of the war program. Payment of this Reconstruction Finance Corporation debt at this time would produce savings to the debtor's estate of many millions of dollars. Yet this payment is being opposed by the financial institutional group sponsoring the pending reorganization plan and (we are informed) by the trustee, in the reorganization proceedings.

Similarly, last June when we urged that action be taken with respect to certain underlying bonds which would effect substantial savings to the trust estate, this same group and Mr. Thompson effectively blocked this step.

Since from the viewpoint of the interests of the bona fide investors in Missouri Pacific securities, and from the viewpoint of the public interest in making cash otherwise idle in the banks available for Government purposes, the repayment of this Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan at this time out of the huge cash balance on hand is so obviously desirable, the question arises: Why is this institutional financial group thus interfering in the Missouri Pacific reorganization? I invite your attention to certain facts from which the motives directing this interference become clear.

2. Current reorganization proceedings are being utilized to vest control of a number of major rail systems in a closely knit financial group.

Analysis of pending reorganization plans sponsored by protective committees representative of this closely knit group of life-insurance companies and banks shows that the reorganized companies will emerge under the actual control and domination of these very same financial institutions. This, of course, is subversive of the established congressional policy urged notably by Senator WHEELER and Commissioner Splawn and crystallized in the enactment in 1942 of the present section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act and its amendment in 1940. Color of legality to the creation of this threatened new colossus of American rail control is afforded, however, by the Interstate Commerce Commission's separate approval of the various plans of reorganization. We cannot believe that in approving these separate plans the Commission is aware of the facts and interlocking interests which threaten this major disaster to the principles sought to be implemented by Congress in its enactment of its rail-control policy.

The procedure common to many of the current rail reorganizations emerges with clarity upon analysis of the interests represented on the dominant "protective" and "reorganization" committees and the devices of control injected by them into the respective reorganization plans. It may be summarized in the following steps:

(1) The mutual institutions (insurance companies and savings banks) are prohibited by State laws from buying voting stocks. This provision is lawfully circumvented, however, by their agreeing to the translation of their lawfully acquired rail bonds into voting stocks in reorganization proceedings.

(2) In some instances (not including the Missouri Pacific, North Western, or Milwaukee) the holdings of this closely knit group of financial institutions through new voting stocks emerging from the reorganization plans, will give them working control of the railroads involved. Some of these railroads

are directly competitive because of their geographical location, and all of them are indirectly competitive because of their through rates and joint through-rate arrangements.

(3) In certain cases, for example, the Missouri Pacific, the Soo Line, the Milwaukee, and the North Western, their stockholdings alone would presumably not give them working control of these railroads and accordingly the reactionary device of a voting trust is injected into the plan and Interstate Commerce Commission sanction obtained thereof. The plans provide that sufficient voting stock will be deposited under the voting trust whereby to obtain effective control over the management of the roads. Provision is also made in the plan, approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that a majority of the voting trustees shall be named by the "protective" or "reorganization" committees which are dominated by this same interlocking institutional clique.

Thus, voting control over such highly competitive roads as the Milwaukee & North Western will emerge under the present reorganization plans in the common hands of the self-same "galaxy of stars" to whom Senator WHEELER referred in 1939.

(4) In the Missouri Pacific case the Stedman "protective" committee not only wrote into the plan that this same institutional group would name three out of the five voting trustees, but also wrote into the plan that it would name 9 of the original 15 directors of the road.

The records indicate that this group actually owns less than 10 percent of the outstanding securities of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

It is the interference of this group in the Missouri Pacific reorganization that obstructs reorganization and the accomplishment of legitimate savings to the tens of thousands of smaller investors.

3. The Missouri Pacific reorganization threatens a large-scale destruction of bona fide investment values in Interstate Commerce Commission approved rail securities, without financial justification.

Senator TRUMAN, as Senator from the State where this railroad is domiciled, I respectfully urge you to examine the pending plan of reorganization for the Missouri Pacific Railroad—a plan sponsored by the insurance companies with their banking associates and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Look first at the interests which compose Mr. John W. Stedman's first and refunding bond protective committee. Look at pages 20 and 25 of the plan (Finance Docket No. 9918) to see the provisions giving this financial group ironclad control of the reorganized company. Then see what the plan proposes to do to the investor in all of the bond issues junior to the issue represented by Mr. Stedman's committee. No better illustration could be given of the price that the bona fide investor is called upon to pay in order that this financial institutional group may add the control of another railroad to its collection.

This plan, although overwhelmingly voted down by six classes of security holders, would force junior bondholders to accept a minority interest in the common stock of the new company on a basis that defies any method of justification. The old preferred and common stocks are declared worthless. This ingenious plan also provides for certain sacrifices on the part of senior bondholders. May I point out that it is absolutely unnecessary for senior bondholders to sacrifice their position of lien in any plan of reorganization for the Missouri Pacific. Nor does this assertion comprehend the reorganization of the company on the basis of wartime earnings. We are more realistic than that, Senator. However, neither do we believe the company should be reorganized on the basis of "dust bowl" earnings in order that insurance-com-

pany bond holdings shall be translated into voting stocks.

Surely you believe that the bondholders should share in the tremendously improved present financial condition of the road. Cash is now close to \$70,000,000 and increasing at the rate of more than \$6,000,000 per month. This monthly increment is probably in excess of the entire cash in the road's treasury when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved the sale of the company's original securities to the public. We should think that the Commission would be gratified to find the Missouri Pacific fulfilling the Commission's original prophecy of earnings for the bonds, instead of approving the destruction of the investment of innocent bondholders in securities whose issuance the Commission approved.

Dr. Splawn, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in his letter to Senator WHEELER, pointed out: "One of the prime purposes of reorganization, both under section 77 and in equity, is the preservation of the interests of the security holders entitled to share in the estate."

4. No speculators are currently interfering in the Missouri Pacific Railroad reorganization.

When Senator WHEELER (committee report, p. 8304) was criticizing the bringing of pressure in reorganizations by "speculators who are buying up railroad securities," you stated "that very thing is happening now in the case of the Missouri Pacific reorganization," and went on to say that Alleghany Corporation was interfering in that reorganization. Your impression that Alleghany Corporation is a speculator in the securities of Missouri Pacific is not true. Alleghany Corporation invested more than \$100,000,000 in the purchase of Missouri Pacific securities, which were issued with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission—all several years prior to the initiation of bankruptcy proceedings in 1933. Official records on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission disclose that Alleghany Corporation has not purchased a single security in the Missouri Pacific or any other railroad or public utility in bankruptcy proceedings. The many thousands of holders of bonds of Alleghany Corporation, to secure which Alleghany Corporation's bona fide investments in Missouri Pacific are pledged, cannot fairly be characterized as "speculators"—nor can their debtor corporation—however great the sins of the original promoters in selling them their securities at investment prices.

We are entirely sympathetic to any curb on speculation whether it be in the bonds of reorganized rails or in steels or rubber. Our country is at war, and we have no patience with speculators or with speculation. However, curbing speculation should not be confused with eliminating the market for what Commissioner Splawn, in his letter to Senator WHEELER, called "necessitous sellers." We concur in Commissioner Splawn's desire to protect the legitimate investor who has made the construction of our great railway systems possible, whether he rides through the reorganization period with his investment or whether he is compelled by necessity to sacrifice it for cash during reorganization. We believe that the splendid work done by the Securities and Exchange Commission in restricting and regulating speculation has been one of the most constructive things that has ever happened in American finance. Yet even the most liberal members of the Securities and Exchange Commission recognize the fact that regulation of speculation may at times injure the bona fide investor by the destruction of the market for his securities, thereby piling misery upon misery. If I may respectfully venture a suggestion in this regard, would it not seem preferable that rather than legislating upon such a complex matter during

the rigors of a tax bill the Securities and Exchange Commission be asked for its recommendations as to legislation to be acted upon after full study of the various aspects of the problem?

Senator, your interest in the Missouri Pacific Railroad is naturally great. Due to the pressure of legislation relating to the war, however, it would be astonishing if you were fully conversant with the ingenious and subversive pressures that are going on in that reorganization. Owing to the national importance and grave implications of this matter and its extreme urgency, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to other Senators. I am sure you will have no objection.

Respectfully yours,

J. C. DAVIS,  
Chairman, Executive Committee,  
Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

#### DIFFICULTIES OF ARIZONA COTTON FARMERS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, last Monday, November 9, I discussed briefly the ultimatum of the Honorable Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Paul McNutt, Chairman of the Federal Manpower Commission, to the cotton pickers of my State. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Arizona Republic of November 7 entitled "Responsibility for Saving Cotton Crop Rests on Those Who Misstated Facts," which treats of the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic of November 7, 1942]

#### RESPONSIBILITY FOR SAVING COTTON CROP RESTS ON THOSE WHO MISSTATED FACTS

The acute situation in which cotton farmers of Arizona now find themselves, and which has brought a wholly unnecessary ultimatum from Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is neither of their own making or of their choosing. The State's cotton growers are victims of that type of inefficiency and lack of essential knowledge on the part of some who are attempting to direct certain phases of the war effort that is slowing down the Nation's war prosecution and delaying the victory. They are being ground between the millstones for that reason as are men in many other industries.

When cotton growers, prior to the planting of this crop of long-staple, heeded the urgent demand of the Government, the Army, and the Navy to double their acreage because the fiber was needed as a substitute for silk in the war effort, they were promised the necessary manpower to plant and harvest the crop. Not one word was mentioned by those in authority, and under whose direction the campaign was carried on to induce the farmers, most of them against their better judgment, to double their acreage, that an attempt would be made to inject new social orders into the cotton-growing industry, or that changes in methods of pay for picking which have been in vogue for the past century would have to be made. The promise was that the necessary manpower would be forthcoming. They now find that it isn't, and they further learn they have been duped.

Cotton growing was one of the chief industries in the Nation for generations. None of those who are threatening through ultimatums and demands to ruin financially the cotton farmers of Arizona and the Nation, not to mention depriving the Nation of a

greatly needed raw material in the war effort, has ever grown cotton or had any experience in solving the industry's problems. In their lack of knowledge of the industry they are attempting to enforce upon it conditions that not only are wholly unworkable but which have a doubtful purpose as their basis. They insist upon doing this in spite of the fact that here in Arizona going to ruin are many thousands of badly needed parachutes in the raw—vehicles of safety, which, unless made, will cost the lives of many hundreds of young men who are bravely battling a foe which threatens the freedom of all Americans.

Except for the definite promise that labor would be forthcoming if acreage were doubled, cotton farmers of Arizona would have grown their usual crop of long-staple cotton, recognizing before it was planted there would be difficulty in picking even a crop of the usual size. They were very reluctant to increase the acreage. It required a campaign of several weeks to induce them to do so. Patriotically they arose to the occasion and put in the crop demanded, relying on the promise, which now appears to have been misrepresented, that no difficulty would be experienced in obtaining labor. For their patriotism, the cotton growers of the State are now being browbeaten in an effort to obtain impossible contracts of which they knew nothing when they were being solicited earlier in the year.

Having risen to the bait of promises which at the eleventh hour of fulfillment appears to have been camouflaged, cotton farmers now are charged with the responsibility by high Government officials of saving the crop, when in reality the responsibility rests squarely and firmly upon the shoulders of those who failed to state the eventual facts during the month-long campaign to increase the cotton acreage last spring.

Cotton picking is not the type of a job that can be carried on under the kind of contract guaranty which it is now demanded that the cotton farmers sign before labor will be imported by the Manpower Commission into the State to pick the cotton. Every person familiar with cotton picking is well aware of that fact. It also is quite obvious to those who know the cotton industry that contract guaranties would create a never-ending controversy. The vital thing that should be uppermost is to get the State's long-staple cotton crop picked before it is ruined without starting a revolution in the entire cotton industry of the Nation.

#### ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE CONGRESS OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Tribute to Russia" delivered by the Vice President at the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, in New York City, on November 8, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ARMISTICE DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Armistice Day speech delivered by Senator MAYBANK to the American Legion and citizens at Columbia, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO SENATOR NORRIS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one entitled "Senator Norris Is Wrong" and the other entitled "The Grand Old Roman," and an editorial from the Springfield State Register, Springfield, Ill., entitled "What? Norris, Too?", which appear in the Appendix.]



# PROGRESSIVES UNITE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR NORRIS

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Progressives Unite," written by Senator Norris and published in the New Republic of September 28, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

# A PARTNERSHIP DRIVE FOR VICTORY— ADDRESS BY GOV. HAROLD E. STASSEN

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address on the subject A Partnership Drive for Victory delivered by Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, on Saturday, November 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

# THE WAR AND LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY R. S. REYNOLDS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject The War and Leadership delivered by R. S. Reynolds, president of the Reynolds Metal Co., to the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce at Birmingham, Ala., on October 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

# RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement from the Department of Agriculture entitled "R. E. A. Systems in Sound Shape for War Effort," which appears in the Appendix.]

# THE MANPOWER PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY GRENVILLE CLARK

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record remarks of Grenville Clark for the Town Meeting of the Air, October 29, 1942, on the topic "How Must We Change Our Manpower Methods to Win the War?" which appears in the Appendix.]

# DEFENSE OF THE CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY T. W. MERRYMAN

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "In Defense of the Congress of the United States," written by T. W. Merryman, president of the National Association of Master Plumbers, which appears in the Appendix.]

# WARTIME CAR USE—STATEMENT BY RUSSELL E. SINGER

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio interview with Russell E. Singer, general manager of the American Automobile Association, on Wednesday, November 4, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

# P. W. A. AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Washington Evening Star entitled "P. W. A. and National Defense" which appears in the Appendix.]

# THE RECORD OF JOSEPH LEIB

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement relative to the record of Joseph Leib, which appears in the Appendix.]

# CONDITIONS IN INDIA

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article, an editorial, and a letter relating to conditions in India, which appear in the Appendix.]

# LESSON FROM THE ELECTION

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Lesson to Be Learned," written

by Josephus Daniels, editor of the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

# REDUCTION OF DRAFT AGE LIMIT—CON- FERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 7528, the bill to reduce the draft age limit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the report.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7528) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That so much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of eighteen and forty-five at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

"Sec. 2. Section 5 (f) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Any person eighteen or nineteen years of age who, while pursuing a course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act during the last half of the academic year at such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed until the end of such academic year."

"Sec. 3. Section 15 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The term "between the ages of eighteen and forty-five" shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner."

"Sec. 4. Section 5 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one shall be discharged from service in the land or naval forces of the United States while this act is in effect because such person entered such service without the consent of his parent or guardian."

"(j) No individual who has been convicted of any crime which may not be punished by death or by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year shall, by reason solely of such conviction, be relieved from liability for training and service under this act."

"(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until

such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work."

"Sec. 5. Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That no man, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service under this act after he has attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of his birth.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,  
ELBERT D. THOMAS,  
LISTER HILL,  
WARREN R. AUSTIN,  
CHAN GURNEY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

A. J. MAY,  
R. E. THOMASON,  
DOW W. HARTER,  
W. G. ANDREWS,  
DEWEY SHORT,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GURNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from South Dakota intend to explain the conference report?

Mr. GURNEY. I intend to give an explanation at this time of the action of the conferees.

Mr. President, the conference report is in the nature of an amendment to the National Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The conferees met Monday afternoon for about 3 hours, and again Tuesday morning for another 2 hours. I believe the conferees have given thorough consideration to every phase of the bill as it passed the House and as it passed the Senate. The report is filed with the unanimous consent and signatures of all the conferees.

The bill, as it passed the House, and the Senate amendment, sections 1 and 3, provided for extending the liability for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to registrants of 18 and 19 years of age. The conference agreement makes no change in that respect. I may call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the conference report is printed, and there is a copy on the desk of each Senator.

Section 2 of the bill, as passed by the House, provided that, upon their request, certain registrants who were in attendance at high schools, colleges, or universities during the academic year 1942-43 might be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces until the end of such academic year, but in no event later than July 1, 1943. The Senate amendment provided that regis-

trants in attendance at high schools or similar institutions of learning might, upon their request, have their induction postponed until the end of the academic year if they were ordered to report for induction during the last half of the academic year. The conference agreement retains the Senate provision and makes it clear that it applies to persons who are 18 or 19 years of age when they are ordered to report for induction.

Section 4 of the bill as it passed the House, and of the Senate amendment, provided that no person between the ages of 18 and 21 should be discharged from service in the land or naval forces because he entered such service without the consent of his parent or guardian. The conference agreement retains this provision.

Section 4 of the Senate amendment also contained a provision corresponding to section 6 of the House bill under which a conviction for certain crimes which were not felonies, or punishable by death or imprisonment for more than 1 year, was not to be used as a basis for relieving the person convicted from liability for training and service in the armed forces, or for rejecting him, if the local selective-service board determined that such person was morally fit for military service. The conference agreement provides that no person convicted of a crime not punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than 1 year should be relieved from such liability for training and service by reason solely of such conviction.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the Army regulation affecting those who have been previously convicted by civil courts, and outlining their status should they apply or should the local selective service board order their induction at this time. This is desirable information to have, because I am sure every Member of Congress has at one time or another had brought to his attention some specific case in his own State of some person seeking to get into the armed services and not knowing the regulations under which he could enter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

There being no objection, the regulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Change to paragraph 7b, Army Regulations 615-500:

b (1) Registrants who have previously been discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard with a form of discharge certificate other than honorable or who were discharged under the provisions of section VIII, Army Regulations 615-360 or the equivalent regulations in the other armed services are acceptable for induction only in meritorious cases specifically approved in each instance by The Adjutant General.

(2) (a) Registrants undergoing confinement as a result of one conviction for the heinous crimes of treason, murder, rape, kidnapping, arson, sodomy, pandering, any crime involving sex perversion, or for any illegal dealing in narcotics or other habit-forming drugs will neither be considered nor accepted for induction under any circumstances.

(b) Registrants convicted of any of the foregoing crimes, but who have been discharged, released on parole, conditional re-

lease, placed on probation or suspended sentence for at least 6 months may be accepted for induction in especially meritorious cases specifically approved in each instance by the commanding general of a service command or department prior to the registrant being forwarded to a recruiting and induction station. An essential prerequisite to approval is determination of the time the individual has lived in a civilian community subsequent to his release from confinement, primarily that in this period his conduct has been above reproach and that the provisions of (4) and (6) below will be met.

(3) (a) Except for the offenses in (2) above, registrants who have been sentenced to and are undergoing confinement for a period in excess of 1 year may be approved for induction in individual cases specifically approved by the commanding general of a service command or department prior to the registrant being forwarded to a recruiting and induction station. As an essential prerequisite to approval evidence must be presented by the Selective Service System and the appropriate parole authorities that the individual is regarded as fit for life in a civilian community; that regardless of acceptability to appropriate parole authorities that the individual is regarded as fit for life in a civilian community; that regardless of acceptability to the Army he is to be placed on parole, conditional release, or discharged contingent only upon development of an adequate means of livelihood; that having been so released he will not be again confined other than for violation of the parole, etc., or commission of another offense; that the provisions of (4) and (6) below will be met and a recommendation as to the period, if any, the individual should be observed in his home community prior to presentation for induction.

(b) Except for first offenders, registrants sentenced and confined as indicated in (3) (a) above and who have been in a civilian community on parole, conditional release, probation, or suspended sentence for at least 90 days may be forwarded for induction at the discretion of the Selective Service System, provided their conduct during this period in the civilian community has been above reproach and the provisions of (4) and (6) below are met, and provided further that if the Selective Service System desires to forward a man in this category for induction prior to the 90-day period cited above a waiver may be requested from the commanding general of a service command or department. First offenders are equally subject to the foregoing stipulations except that their period in the community without a waiver from the commanding general of a service command or department shall be limited to 30 days.

(4) Regardless of the offense committed, registrants who are found to be in frequent difficulty with the law-enforcement authorities, who have displayed criminal tendencies or traits of character which would render them unfit or undesirable associates of enlisted men; or whose records indicate a long history of antisocial behavior; or who are otherwise of questionable reputation or moral character will not be accepted for induction. However, in instances regarded by the Selective Service System as exceptional, individual cases may be forwarded to the commanding general of a service command or department for decision prior to forwarding for induction.

(5) Registrants convicted of violation of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, will be accepted for induction at any time, provided the Attorney General of the United States has granted and subsequently suspended parole for the purpose of induction.

(6) In all instances, including any not specifically mentioned above, involving the induction of men on parole, conditional re-

lease, probation, or suspended sentence, it is mandatory that the parole, conditional release, probation, or suspended sentence be either terminated or suspended for the period of military service, either with or without credit for such service. Prior to being forwarded for induction evidence of such suspension or termination will be mailed to the recruiting and induction station concerned by the Selective Service System together with an official copy of the military waiver when the latter is required by these regulations.

Prior waivers are required for moral fitness only as prescribed in (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) above. In all other cases registrants will be forwarded to recruiting and induction stations on the judgment of the Selective Service System. However, a registrant will be rejected when the commanding officer of a recruiting and induction station determines that the waivers prescribed herein are required and have not been furnished. A letter report of the cause for the rejection will be submitted to the commanding general of the service command or department who will give similar advice to the appropriate State director of selective service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do the regulations of the Army provide that if a man has been convicted of a felony, regardless of how long he has been imprisoned and regardless of anything else, he cannot be inducted into the service?

Mr. GURNEY. The Army's basic thought in this matter—and the regulations so read—is that if the civil authorities feel that a previously convicted criminal has been discharged from the corrective institution, and is thought suitable, first by the warden, then by the parole board, and then by the Governor, to live among civilians, he is suitable for service with the armed forces. That is the basic thought and is covered by the regulation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that, but suppose a man is free and walking around like everyone else.

Mr. GURNEY. Then it would be possible for him to enlist, or it would be possible for a local board to draft him, if his conviction was not for a major crime.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the question I am trying to have answered. What is a major crime? Is any felony a major crime?

Mr. GURNEY. The regulation states definitely that no dealer in narcotics, such activity being a major crime, may be accepted. The Army does not want such a man among the soldiers. The regulation also lists kidnapping, and other offenses which we all know are major crimes. If the civil authorities feel that a man can resume his life, that he is a reformed person, and that it is all right for him to live among the people of his community, it is all right for him to serve in the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. That policy has not heretofore been followed by the War Department. Has it not rejected all those who have been convicted of crimes?

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly there is a more liberal attitude on the part of the Army now than there has been, and it is so stated in the regulations.



Section 5 of the Senate amendment provided for the deferment from training and service in the land and naval forces of persons found by the selective service local boards to be regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, and also provided for making any persons who left such an occupation or endeavor immediately available for military service unless, prior to leaving the selective service local board determined that it was in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave for other work. There was no corresponding provision in the bill as it passed the House. The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with clarifying changes, and makes such deferment applicable to men found by the local boards to be necessary to and regularly engaged in such agricultural occupations and endeavors.

I may say that the only change made by the conferees was to add four words, "to be necessary to."

Section 6 of the Senate amendment provided that no man should be inducted for training and service after he reached the age of 45. That was the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with the qualification that induction of men of 45 shall not take place "without their consent."

Section 5 of the House bill contained a provision that no person who had been deferred from training and service should be inducted prior to induction of "all persons within the same State who have been placed in categories made subject to induction prior to the category in which such person has been placed." There was no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The conference agreement eliminates this provision of the House bill.

Section 7 of the Senate amendment provided that no person under 20 years of age who was inducted should be placed in actual combat duty beyond the territorial boundaries of the United States until after he had at least 1 year's military training following his induction. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The conference agreement eliminates the Senate provision.

Mr. President, I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not exactly understand what the Senator said about the Ellender amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. No change was made in the Ellender amendment except that if a man passes 45 years of age while he is still a registrant, and has not yet been called, he can either get in or stay out, whichever he wishes.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senate-House Conference Committee has eliminated from the teen-age draft bill the Senate amendment providing that these youths be given 1 year's military training before being placed in foreign combat duty.

I voted for the teen-age draft bill with the amendment, and I shall also vote for it without the amendment, solely because our Commander in Chief has requested the passage of this bill as a war measure. I intend to support all war legislation requested by him during this crisis, because the people of the Nation have selected him as our Commander in Chief and, as such, upon his shoulders rests the undivided responsibility of conducting this war.

The amendment was added in the Senate by the proper functioning of our legislative machinery, and I supported the bill with the amendment. The amendment was later eliminated in the conference committee by the proper functioning of our legislative machinery, and inasmuch as I believe in our orderly democratic legislative system I shall support the bill with the amendment eliminated. The parliamentary situation is such that there is now no way for us to vote on reinstating the amendment which was stricken out by the conference committee. We are forced into the helpless position of either accepting the bill without the amendment or not accepting the bill at all.

I am sorry this situation prevails, but I have done everything I possibly could do to have my amendment retained in the bill.

Mr. President, I honestly believed that my amendment improved the bill, and I still believe that the bill would have provided the citizens of our Nation with assurance of a more thoroughly trained and better Army if my amendment had been retained.

I wish to state that my main reason for supporting the 1 year's training amendment was not, as proclaimed by some of our critics to be, on account of heart-string sympathy for the mothers of the teen-age boys. My sympathy goes equally to the mothers of all the boys and men in the service regardless of age, because I know that a mother's love for her son seldom diminishes as he grows older. To her he is always her boy, regardless of his age.

One of my main reasons for supporting the 1 year's training amendment was to strengthen our military forces, because surely nobody will dispute the fact that an army of fully trained soldiers is more protection to our Nation than an army of partially trained boys. I not only believe that our teen-age boys should have 1 year's training before going into foreign combat duty, but I believe that our soldiers of all ages should have at least that much training when they are to fight enemies who have, in most cases, had more training than that, and much actual experience in war.

In arriving at the proper minimum length of time of training a soldier should have, I relied upon the abundant testimony of some of our high-ranking Army officers, which was given before the Military Affairs Committee this year, and especially the testimony given last year when the military officers were trying to secure the enactment of legislation which would extend the training period from 12 months to 18 months. The argument and testimony of many military officers then was that 12 months was the mini-

mum, and that the Selective Service Act should be amended so that our boys would have 18 months' training. If they needed 18 months' training during peacetime, when they had no enemies to fight, surely it is more important now during the war-time that they have even more military training before they are thrown into foreign combat duty against hordes of highly trained and long-experienced fighters.

Based on that testimony of many of our high-ranking generals, many Senators, including myself, agreed with them, and decided to strengthen their hands by writing into the law of the land the guarantee that they would have soldiers fully trained in accordance with their ideas. We were not opposing the views of the generals of our Army. We were in perfect agreement with them. We not only agreed with them, but we put it down in black and white in our amendment, so that any of their subordinate officers who might now, or in the future, differ with them, would still be bound to obey the law, and thus respect the wishes of the high-ranking generals, and of the Senators who shared the same ideas.

Our Nation is a government of laws, not edicts of individuals, or at least it is supposed to be, according to the way I understand our Constitution. Generals may come and generals may go, but our laws go on forever. According to our form of government, our people have come to depend more on the law than they do on the promises of individuals who may be here today and gone tomorrow. I am a strong believer in the idea that it is the duty of the Congress to write definite laws to accomplish definite purposes, and not simply shift important problems to various Government departments by loosely worded and indefinite legislation, in the hope that those upon whom the duties are imposed may be able to read the mind of Congress and properly carry out the will of the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. President, I have the feeling that the widespread discussion of this amendment has been beneficial to our national war effort, because those in charge of the training must now realize that they alone will carry the full responsibility of properly training our teen-age boys. If these boys should be sent into foreign combat duty with less than 12 months' training and meet serious reverses, certainly no blame can be placed on any of the 39 Senators who voted my amendment into the bill for that amendment, if it had been retained in the bill, would have made such training mandatory.

Mr. President, there is another phase of this matter about which I should like to make a few observations at this time. I have noticed that in the fight against the amendment carried on by some of the press, radio, and public officials, the argument has been quite extensively used that Members of Congress are not military experts and should, therefore, not exercise their own judgment, but, instead, should enact legislation dealing with military matters exactly as dictated by our military experts. That kind of argument on the surface carries some weight with some people, but when carefully studied and properly analyzed it

does not dovetail with our form of government. The same argument is used when tax matters are before Congress. It is said that Members of Congress are not tax experts; therefore, we should not rely on our own ideas, but should instead enact tax legislation as dictated by the Treasury Department. The same applies to labor legislation. It is asked, "What do the Members of Congress know about labor problems?" Therefore, we should not use our own judgment but should enact labor legislation as dictated by the experts in the Department of Labor. The same thing is true of our highly important agricultural problems, and other important problems which come before this body. So that argument, carried to its logical conclusion, would result in eliminating the need of any Congress at all. That is a philosophy of government to which I am unable to subscribe. I welcome sound, constructive criticism, but that kind is not sound. I believe most of the Members of the Senate resent that kind of argument, and I believe most of the good people of our Nation resent it. I do not know of any of the Members of Congress who claim to be infallible; neither do we admit that any other public officials are infallible. We are all human and, therefore, subject to error. But until the majority of the people of this Nation, by their votes, change our form of government, I intend to carry on in accordance with the terms of our present Constitution. Regardless of any criticism, ridicule, and abuse which may be hurled at Congress, I intend honestly and conscientiously to do everything within my power to help retain our American form of democracy so that it may still be functioning when our millions of brave, fighting soldiers have won this war and return home.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to make a few brief remarks about what I consider to be the real damper on our war effort. The drafting of our teen-age boys was made necessary largely because of a so-called man shortage. This so-called man shortage has been created by labor leader racketeers selling jobs for money. The more jobs they sell the more money they make. They have therefore put two men at most every bench and at every desk where one man could better do the job. Restricting the length of the work-week creates more jobs for these labor leader racketeers to sell for money. They also force slowdown practices in factories which create more jobs for them to sell for money. It is terrible to think of this horrible situation existing while our brave soldiers are fighting on distant battlefields, many of them dying, because of lack of sufficient war weapons.

The shortage of war weapons exists because our production line is not producing to its maximum capacity because of the racketeering practices being carried on by the labor leader racketeers. While I am a true friend of the honest men who toil, and I believe that they, too, abhor the practices forced upon them by their racketeering leaders, yet it is well known that I am opposed to the tactics of these labor leader racketeers. Ever since I

came to Congress I have been endeavoring to obtain the enactment of legislation which would outlaw some of their nefarious racketeering. I have introduced bills to outlaw force and violence in labor disputes, to abolish the 40-hour work-week, and to abolish the closed shop. Until that kind of legislation is enacted we will continue to encounter grave problems adversely affecting our successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the next grave danger facing us is serious food shortage, which is being brought on, in part, by this 40-hour week creating more high salaried jobs, which have attracted men from farms in such large numbers that our farm production has fallen off at an alarming rate, and will continue to decrease unless some prompt action is taken along this line to correct the situation. In this great land of plenty it is difficult to contemplate a serious food shortage. Nevertheless, it is staring us in the face right now. Rationing of some food commodities is now in effect, and food articles on grocers' shelves are rapidly diminishing.

Mr. President, I hope Congress will soon enact legislation which will curb the nefarious practices of labor leader racketeers which have slowed down and are still slowing down our whole war effort.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have a word of comment relative to that portion of the conference report on the pending legislation which deals with the deferment of agricultural labor. That section, as set forth in the report of the conferees which is on the desks of Senators, reads as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

Mr. President, in the first place, I submit that that provision of the bill is inadequate to deal with the manpower problem. In the second place, it is unfair to the agricultural workers who would be frozen into their jobs by the proposed legislation.

I am sure there is no disagreement among Senators as to the necessity of carrying on essential farm operations. There is no failure on the part of any Senator to recognize the problem. We all desire to provide an adequate supply of labor to produce farm commodities which are necessary to the prosecution of the war effort of this country and of those associated with us in the war.

In the first place, the approach which the proposed legislation makes fails to take cognizance of the nature and character of the manpower problem. I believe it to be a fact that the administrative machinery of the Government has too long neglected the problem of manpower. In my judgment there has been a grievous division of authority and responsibility among the agencies of the Government dealing with the problem. I am told that there are 28 agencies of the Government purporting to deal with the question of manpower. There is a section of the War Production Board which purports to deal with manpower. There is a section of the Services of Supply in the Army purporting to deal with the same problem, independently of the War Production Board. There is the Manpower Commission, which has its own field and scope of operation, independent, in most activities, from the other agencies dealing with the subject.

The result is that the Federal Government has not comprehensively viewed the manpower problem and comprehensively dealt with it by setting up adequate and effective machinery to handle that problem. It can never be effectively dealt with until that is done. That is what ought to be done, rather than for the Congress to deal with a phase of the problem by legislative fiat. If the Congress is to lay down a policy with respect to manpower and the solution of the labor problem, surely Congress will not deal solely with agriculture, but with industry as well.

A subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee over which I have had the honor to preside has for weeks been hearing witnesses from almost every field of national endeavor on the acuteness of the manpower problem. We have heard those who told of industry's needs. We have heard representative members of draft boards who have come to tell about their problem, dealing with it with their limited authority and from their limited point of view. We have heard representatives of industry tell about their plight, and their inability to retain men in essential places in essential war industries.

There has been no machinery to enable them effectively to carry on the production of the most essential war goods and materials, whether they be engaged in tool making, the production of aircraft or tanks, the production of torpedo tubes for the Navy, or any other essential war activity which I might mention. They find the national manpower policy totally inadequate to meet the manpower needs of the Nation, a division of governmental responsibility and a multiplication of Federal agencies to deal with the problem, and a muddled philosophy behind the agencies which do exist.

The situation became so bad that a few days ago I believe it was almost assumed throughout the country—and perhaps also in the Congress—that some executive fiat was to be issued chaining every man to his job, or giving some man or agency the power to direct American citizens into involuntary servitude for the profit of their fellow citizens.



In this investigation we actually found, as was testified by the medical head of Mr. Kaiser's group hospital unit, that the medical association's representative in the State of Washington told the doctors in that hospital, which was giving medical care and attention to the employees of Mr. Kaiser's company engaged exclusively in war work, that if they attended the wives and children of the workers he would see to it that those doctors were taken into the Army through the machinery of the Selective Service.

Mr. President, some grievous things have been disclosed to the committee by witnesses from various parts of the country. In some of our Southern States, which already had a gross inadequacy of doctors—sometimes as few as one doctor to more than 4,000 people—a weighted quota was established by the American Medical Association. In South Carolina that quota was exceeded by voluntary enlistment, which was permitted, and by coercive practices, to the extent of 170 percent. In other States the quota was exceeded to the extent of more than 200 percent, until a part of the civilian population was deprived of medical care, to become the victim of any epidemic which might happen to come along.

In spite of the fact that tuberculosis is increasing as an incident of the war, there has been no increase in facilities; and although Dr. Parran testified that he had recommended the establishment of 290 hospitals to take care of the 5,000,000 migratory war workers coming as an additional burden to the several communities of this country, only 218 were approved, only 51 are under construction, and only 2 have been built.

So the record is that the manpower problem has been muddled administratively. Now we propose to muddle it legislatively. It has been dealt with in part when it could not be comprehensively dealt with in that manner; and now we propose to cure administrative deficiency by legislative inadequacy.

So what have we done, Mr. President? We have been asked to freeze agricultural workers into necessary jobs by Congressional enactment. Whose opinion is to govern? That of the national deferment boards, which have the whole picture, industrially and agriculturally, and from the point of view and perspective of transportation and service? No. Subject to a national agency which has the whole picture? No. We are asked to say that the local selective service board, which at best has only the perspective of a small area and a relatively small interest compared to the whole Nation, shall be called upon to determine whether a man is engaged in necessary agricultural activity, and whether or not he is irreplaceable.

Mr. President, from the viewpoint of the Nation, that is an inadequate approach to the manpower problem. The only way the problem can possibly be dealt with effectively is by having, in the first place, an effective coordination of all war activities under an essential authority so that it shall still be within a single source of power; and, secondly, a correlation and coordination of the whole civilian war effort.

On the contrary, the structure is so loosely knit, and there is so much lost motion in its operation, that we have overlapping of authority, conflict of power, inadequacy of point of view in certain agencies, and in many places a shortage of critical war materials which results in available labor and hungry machines standing idle.

Today, my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] condemned all labor. I think it may be fairly said that he did so without factual justification. It was testified before our committee by the vice president of the Steel Workers' Union that the average workweek of the steel worker was only 37 hours, due to a shortage of material in that industry.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should like to correct the statement of the able Senator from Florida. The Senator from Texas did not condemn all labor. He was merely referring to a few labor leader racketeers. I have the utmost respect for the laboring people of this Nation. I come from that class of people, and I believe they are doing a commendable job. They are working to the extent to which they are privileged to work, and they would like to work much longer.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. I am sure he would not want his remarks to be understood by anyone as being a blanket condemnation of all men who belong to unions, or who are engaged in war work as laborers. Unfortunately, in all categories—in political and professional life, as well as in the realm of agriculture and industry—there are those who "soldier" on the job or take advantage of and pervert their powers.

However, Mr. President, what I was saying was that in many instances we have not controlled the flow of raw materials so as to give work to the labor which is available. In many instances we have not sufficiently utilized the manpower which we have throughout the country.

A few days ago a man testified before the committee that when the President visited a certain airplane factory in the South, some bombers were brought in to give the impression that they had been manufactured in that factory, and when he left the bombers were returned to the place from which they had been borrowed to make a showing. Affidavits were presented to the committee from workers in that factory. In one affidavit a man stated that he had been on the job for 50 days, but that he had not been at work more than 6 hours because there was inadequacy of planning and ineffective utilization of the willing labor already on the job.

Mr. President, there is no more crucial problem facing the country or the world than the problem of dealing with manpower. As I have said, a few days ago it was almost assumed in Washington that the next day, or the day thereafter, there would be a proposal to the Congress to pass some compulsory or coercive act, and give to some person or agency the power to put the finger of compulsion on any American citizen. Mr. President, at some time the war may make demands

upon us which will require the enactment of authority to require compliance on the part of those who are delinquent and derelict in duty and patriotism; but the record certainly establishes that today the fault lies not in the unwillingness of the citizenry of America to work but in the lack of intelligent planning and use of their willing and voluntary effort.

In the matter of agriculture it has been testified before the committee that two-thirds of the farm workers of the country produce only one-third of the agricultural output of the Nation in dollar value and volume. So if we freeze a workman in his job on the farm we may freeze him in a nonessential agricultural occupation to grow some commodity which we can do without. At the same time, we may be freezing him into a job in which, in the nature of things, he cannot contribute what he should be contributing to the national productive effort of agriculture. That shows the fallacy and error of freezing a man into the job he has, without regard to whether it is the place where he can best serve, or where he prefers to serve his country.

What about the individual, Mr. President? It is not necessary to tell Members of the Senate that agricultural labor is the lowest-paid group of our employees. Yet by this legislation they are chained to their jobs and denied the opportunity the industrial worker has to better himself by taking a better job. There may be in a given community a little factory paying an inadequate wage to its workers, but any one of its workers, hearing of a better job, can pick up and go to that employment without anybody restraining him from doing so. If, however, he happens to be a farm worker, instead of working in the little factory, the local selective service board will put him in the Army, if he dares to try to get a better job or more pay.

Mr. President, I wonder if the Congress desires to impose such a restraint and to deny equality of opportunity to the men and the women who work on the farms, particularly to the men who are eligible for selective service in this country. Are they, in the national interest for the duration of the war, to be condemned to an inadequate wage, when they do not generally have a War Labor Board to protect them, when they do not have a union to make their collective bargaining plea effective? We know that agricultural workers have not been effectively organized. A little worker on a little farm or a little worker on a big farm will come tripping up by himself, if he comes at all, to ask that he be allowed to better himself; but can the draft boards give him authority to do it and carry out the spirit of this legislation? No. There is not anything in the measure about his being allowed to better himself. We just "freeze" him and chain him to his job, although, in one part of the country or another, men on the farms today are working for less wage than any other respectable and honorable and essential part of the war effort. At least, Mr. President, if the worker is to be chained to his job on the farm, should there not be an obligation on somebody's part, the Economic Stabilization Director or some other appropriate agency, to see to it that he is fairly dealt with by his

country which commandeers his service? No. All we do is to freeze him in the noncontributory position in which he may happen to be found.

Mind you, Mr. President, I said that two-thirds of the agricultural workers of America are so situated as to be able to contribute only one-third of the Nation's dollar value of agricultural produce. So we are, relatively speaking, freezing two-thirds of the manpower engaged upon the farms in the place where they are not serving to their maximum capacity. Sometimes it is due to the soil upon which they work being poor; again it is due to the inadequacy of equipment because of lack of capital; sometimes it is due to bad management or it may be due to one of many causes, but the fact is that agricultural labor, in too many cases, is not now being given its maximum opportunity to serve its country in the production of essential agricultural commodities.

I realize that at this stage of the consideration of this measure the Senate is not going to be disposed to send it back to conference or change its attitude exhibited in the past, but I felt that some comment might be appropriate to the Senate and some suggestion might be made that we are simply "freezing" maladjustment into permanence when we adopt a provision of this sort. I am sure that we want to be fair to the country as a whole that requires adequacy of planning and effectiveness of administration in respect to this difficult subject; I am sure we want to be fair to every man; but the Senate, when it adopts this conference report today, will have frozen the first class of workers to their jobs. That is a serious thing, Mr. President. Remember we are not freezing the proprietors on their farms; we are freezing essentially the employees who work for profit for men engaged in private enterprise. If it is fair for the farmer, is it not fair for the factory? Would we be willing to adopt it now as a national policy?

In the last few days the Labor Management Committee of the War Manpower Commission has made a report to the President which has attracted national attention. It considers this problem to be soluble on a basis of voluntary cooperation by the workers. The President himself has indicated that it was premature to consider the compulsion of manpower. Day after day Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Mr. Luhrsen, of the railway executives, the heads of many of the principal unions of the Railway Brotherhoods, the heads of most of the C. I. O. unions, the head of the machinist union, and the head of the electrical workers' union have come before our committee, and have pleaded for the privilege of cooperation and not to be made the victim of compulsion by a national manpower policy which misunderstood the nature and the difficulty of the problem.

Now the Congress, in the face of all those recommendations, in the face of the sentiment of the people of this country, who want more intelligent and efficient administration and less cover-up bungling by coercive legislation—the

Congress, I say, is today about to "freeze" the first class of laborers to their jobs.

I wonder, Mr. President, if Senators would not rather the matter be further considered than that that most significant step be taken by the Congress at this time when all these efforts are underway to find a solution of this problem?

Here in the Senate itself the Committee on Education and Labor has been considering the problem and has had hearings for several weeks, and, by the Truman committee a report has today been filed or will be filed. A subcommittee of the Truman committee, headed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], is studying the manpower problem. The Military Affairs Committee has several bills pertaining to the problem before it, and it, too, has had several hearings. So at least two regular committees and one special committee of the Senate are considering this difficult problem and trying to find a solution.

Then here a week or more ago, a Senator rises on the floor and offers this agricultural deferment freezing amendment. It is adopted on the floor. It is slightly modified in conference. We adopt it, if we do what it is recommended we shall do here today on the floor, without any consideration whatever of the question of adequately solving this problem without any coercion upon any class of our people.

So, Mr. President, while I favor drafting boys 18 and 19 years of age, and I favor the other features of the conference report, I very strenuously disagree with this provision relative to freezing agricultural labor in a way that does not meet the needs of the Nation, in a way that is unfair and unjust and discriminatory to men who are the victims of this legislative mismanagement of the problem which already has been so sadly dealt with by our Nation, though at war.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the conference report, for the purpose of instructing the conferees further to consider the provision I have just read, which is paragraph (k) of section 4, set out on page 2 of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The Chair will state the first motion of the Senator is not in order, since the question is stated in the affirmative. The objective sought by the Senator can be achieved by a majority of the Senate voting in the negative.

As to the Senator's second motion, the Chair will state that the House already has adopted the report and the conferees of the House have been discharged. Therefore, the motion would not be in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. The proper motion, then, would be that the Senate disagree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator's objective, if he desires a rejection of the report, would be attained should a majority of the Senate vote against the motion which is stated in the

affirmative, namely, that the conference report be agreed to. If the report were rejected, it would then be in order to make a motion for a further conference and to instruct the conferees.

Mr. PEPPER. Then it would be appropriate for the Senate, if it should choose to do so, to designate conferees and direct them to participate in a further conference and request a conference on the part of the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would be in order after a motion to ask for a further conference were agreed to and before the conferees were appointed. A motion would then be in order to instruct the Senate conferees.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the statement of the parliamentary situation by the Chair, I will not be in a position to make any affirmative motion. I wish to say, however, that, upon that sole ground alone, I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report. I hope the conference report will not be adopted and that the Senate immediately after its failure to adopt it, should it fail to adopt it, will then take the necessary steps to call a further conference with the managers on the part of the House and give instructions to the Senate conferees that this provision either be deleted or that it be further considered by the conferees.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—MANPOWER (PT. 11 OF REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks just made by the able Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I think that this is an opportune time to render to the Senate a report prepared by the Committee to Investigate Defense Contracts. In submitting the report to the Senate, I have a few comments I desire to make before I place the report before this body.

Several weeks ago a subcommittee was designated by the committee to study the manpower problem. That subcommittee, finding that open hearings would not get the best information, held executive hearings in order that all information might be made available. At the conclusion of those executive hearings a full and detailed report, with supporting data, was rendered to the full committee. The full committee directed that information and supporting data of a strategic and confidential nature be stricken from the report to be rendered to the Senate, and that the remainder of the report be submitted.

I should like to point out a few high lights of the report before filing it.

In the first place, the War Manpower Commission was created by Executive order on April 18 of this year, with the Federal Security Administrator as Chairman. Its task, as set forth in the order, was to—

Formulate plans and programs and establish basic national policies to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of manpower in the prosecution of the war; and issue such policy and operating directives as may be necessary thereto.



The President and the Congress expected and believed that the War Manpower Commission would complete its basic studies within a few months and that on the basis thereof it would formulate, at least, tentatively, the policies which its studies indicated should be established and would make recommendations designed to effectuate such policies. That was 7 months ago. The studies are incomplete, and no basic national manpower policy or program has been formulated.

The public knows there is a manpower problem, for every time one tries to hire a man he discovers its existence. We are sometimes prone to criticize the public and nongovernmental agencies for the existence of that manpower problem.

The formulation of such a policy is basic, and until it is formulated and tried out, it will be impossible to determine what if any legislation is necessary to effectuate it. Consequently, although the investigation being made by the subcommittee on manpower is not complete, and will continue, the subcommittee on manpower has rendered its report. The subcommittee is convinced that once a definite and clear-cut manpower policy which makes sense is announced to the public, and the cooperation of management, labor, and agriculture asked in its execution, such voluntary cooperation will be forthcoming in full measure from the overwhelming majority of the public.

When and if such voluntary cooperation falls short of making such a program fully effective, then Congress can and should provide for such compulsory compliance as is necessary, and only in the areas where it is necessary. The real strength of any program will always rest on patriotic, voluntary cooperation in making it effective. But it is futile to appeal for that kind of cooperation until a program is formulated.

It is the conclusion of the Subcommittee on Manpower that a basic manpower policy cannot be developed without covering the manpower requirements of the armed services, as well as those for war production and essential civilian work. The War Manpower Commission has been handicapped because it has had no voice whatever in determining the military manpower requirements or the rate at which they shall be met.

In an all-out war, a world-wide war, such as the one in which we are now engaged, which is the first one of its kind in which we have ever participated, the Nation becomes an integrated industry. There are really only two efforts. One is the military effort, which includes the governmental agencies necessary to carry on the war. The other is the civilian effort, which furnishes the supplies for carrying on the war, and for the subsistence of the civilians. Everything else comes within the luxury class. The two programs, the civilian effort and the military effort, must be completely coordinated, and each must work with full information of the other.

There are three variables which must be adjusted to our over-all manpower resources, including potential resources, before an effective over-all policy can be developed. One is the number of men to

be taken for the armed services. A second is the amount of war production, and the manpower required to produce it, needed both to equip and supply our own forces, and to meet our commitments to our allies. The third variable is the volume of manpower required to supply essential civilian needs. The Subcommittee on Manpower believes that the third variable can and should be cut down as far as is necessary to win the war, and that there is still considerable conversion slack in this item.

But even if we begin by stripping our civilian economy to the bone, it is apparent that the other two factors, military manpower and military production, must be adjusted to fit our maximum potential manpower. Otherwise, we are in danger of recruiting a huge fighting force and then finding that we have cut down industry manpower so much that it cannot produce equipment and supplies needed by that fighting force.

This means, first, that our general staff must check its war strategy plans, insofar as manpower and production requirements are concerned, against our total manpower resources to make sure that an efficient balance is achieved; and second, that the official or agency responsible for manpower mobilization must have some voice in and knowledge of these war requirements in order to do an effective job. To do this we must determine whether we are going to fight an offensive or a defensive war, because the materials needed are different. So far as possible we should determine where and when and who we are going to fight and adjust our production accordingly. It is more important to have the right number of men in the right places equipped and the necessary transport and supplies to maintain them there than it is to have huge reservoirs of men and materials available for an attempt to meet the enemy after he has chosen the fighting ground and has gained the advantage of the initiative.

Such matters relate to the highest war strategy, and the strictest possible secrecy consistent with providing the men and materials should be maintained. We do not desire to know what such plans are. I am sure the Congress, and no Member of it, desires to know; I am sure the Nation does not want to know what they are. But it does desire assurance that such plans have in fact been formulated and that the size of the armed forces and the quantities of war materials have been coordinated with such plans. For instance, the war in the Pacific area would require different equipment from one in the north African area and one in the Asiatic area would require still different equipment.

We must avoid any attempt to determine our military requirements solely by the number of males of military age who can pass the physical fitness tests or our production of the important items of war material by the quantity of basic material available for use. The Subcommittee on Manpower has examined many of the figures on such matters which have been made public and some which have been furnished to it confidentially for the purpose of determining whether there

are any fundamental adjustments which will have to be made.

The subcommittee has two main recommendations to make:

1. In order to assure a sound basic approach to the problem, the Subcommittee on Manpower recommends that military manpower and war production plans be balanced against our over-all manpower resources, that a single head be made responsible for the manpower program and that this director know and have a voice in final determination of military and war production manpower demands.

2. In order to assure that withdrawals of men from industry for the armed forces will be made in orderly fashion and will result in the least injury to essential production, the Subcommittee on Manpower recommends:

A. That all recruiting by the armed services be stopped immediately. Volunteering should be permitted, but only with the approval of Selective Service and local manpower committees. The Selective Service System and manpower agency should fix the date when a volunteer is called to active duty dependent on the length of time it will take to replace the volunteer at his work, in those instances where the volunteer's immediate severance from his work would disrupt production. The Subcommittee on Manpower has been told of numerous instances where unrestricted recruiting has seriously disrupted production. The withdrawal of several million men from industry in the next year can be accomplished without extreme damage to production only if the withdrawals are planned carefully and keyed to a training program for replacement workers. That, in turn, can be done only if one agency controls the withdrawals.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Am I to understand that the subcommittee itself and the full committee are drawing a sharp distinction between the recruiting campaigns and enlistments, and am I correct in understanding that the recommendation is that the recruiting campaigns be discontinued?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. That individuals be permitted to enlist if they desire to enlist?

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is correct, but that the time of anyone's withdrawal from industry, if it is an essential industry, be effected at the date when he can be replaced, not to take a keyman out of a factory, even under voluntary enlistment, until another man can be put in his place.

Mr. BURTON. It would put an end to high-pressure methods, and would provide for enlistments based on the needs of the individual and of the country?

Mr. KILGORE. And with the desires of the individual governed and covered by the needs of the war industry.

B. Selective Service and the United States Employment Service should be closely coordinated to carry out an effective over-all manpower policy. Both agencies should be under control of the manpower agency, nationally, regionally, and in local areas. Local manpower committees, including representatives of management, labor, and agriculture, should be set up to assist in the manpower program and to help solve problems by voluntary cooperation wherever possible. Wherever possible, they should be given, subject to appropriate appeals, the determining voice in how to apply locally the basic national manpower policies.

C. Wherever critical labor shortages develop in a particular industry, as is now the case in dairy and livestock farming and copper mining, the powers of selective service should be used to keep existing workers in these industries. This can be done by a directive to local boards to defer those essential to the industry with provision that such deferment is to be revoked immediately if the men leave the industry and seek employment elsewhere, or when replacements are made available. This procedure is now being utilized to meet the labor problem on dairy and livestock farms and could be used in other critical situations, both local and national.

3. In order to facilitate the bringing of four to seven million new workers into the labor force, most of whom must be women, the Subcommittee on Manpower recommends:

A. All industry training programs should be stepped up; unskilled men who are physically and otherwise eligible for military service should be excluded from such training—which will require action by the Congress to eliminate the limit on National Youth Administration training—and all such training programs should be supervised and controlled by the manpower agency.

B. Expansion of nursery schools and programs for care of school-age children after school hours should be expanded rapidly, so as to make it possible for mothers to take jobs in industry. The effect on her husband's dependency status under Selective Service of a wife working also should be investigated, and if it is found that this is preventing any substantial number of women from working, changes should be made. A public campaign should be conducted to encourage women to enter industry in large numbers.

C. An aggressive campaign, through local manpower committees, should be undertaken to make hiring policies of employers conform to manpower policies, and to eliminate hiring prejudices of all kinds, whether because of age, sex, or race. The Subcommittee on Manpower believes that the key to solution of our manpower problem lies in proper hiring policies rather than in coercive measures applied to the individual employee. Therefore, if voluntary measures to direct hiring into the proper channels fail, the Subcommittee on Manpower would urge legislation giving the manpower agency authority to control hiring by an employer when it found he was noncooperative, rather than legislation giving the manpower agency greater control over the individual employee.

D. A similar campaign, coordinated with that on hiring, should be undertaken to induce employers in nonessential industries, particularly trade and service enterprises, to reduce their total employment by reducing the services performed and to replace men with women wherever possible. This could be implemented, if necessary, by Selective Service regulations making deferment of men in such industries more difficult regardless of dependency status.

E. State and Federal regulations which interfere with the employment of handicapped persons or those receiving public assistance should be suspended for the duration. An example is the regulation which requires a complete reinvestigation of a person now receiving old-age assistance if he takes employment and later wants again to receive assistance. Another example is State insurance and safety laws which make it impossible or prohibitive in cost to an employer to employ handicapped persons. If necessary, the Federal Government should assume the extra costs involved in employing such persons for the duration. Many State laws and regulations which prevented obtaining maximum transportation on highways already have been suspended for the duration.

F. Study should be given to the possibility of ordering those industries and services

which are least connected with the war effort to reduce their activities and thereby to release labor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am interested in paragraph C, and I believe it can stand underlining. I read from it:

The Subcommittee on Manpower believes that the key to solution of our manpower problem lies in proper hiring policies rather than in coercive measures applied to the individual employee.

It seems to me that too much of the approach, particularly in manpower, too much of our regulation of industry, has gotten down to the smallest possible unit. It seems obvious to me that if we are to try to handle the manpower problem by taking every individual American, 60,000,000 of them, by the scruff of the neck and putting them where some bureau decides they belong, we will create a manpower problem in Government itself which it will be impossible to solve. The number of employees who would be required to handle the job on that kind of basis simply are not available. If we are to do the job we must attack it on the broad basis of seeing that, through proper hiring policies, through campaigns to eliminate men in nonessential industries and for the replacement of men by women. We should do the job in that way, rather than by getting down to the individual citizens.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct, and I thank him. The really voluntary and democratic approach to the matter is through the hiring of employees, as the Senator has said.

The fourth recommendation of the Subcommittee on Manpower is that in order to increase the productivity of our present labor force to the utmost:

A. A vigorous campaign should be instituted against absenteeism in industry, which in some fields is cutting production as much as 10 percent. This campaign should be tied in with the two urged above and should include a strong publicity drive. If necessary in some industries, revocation of selective-service deferments in cases of chronic absenteeism could be used to implement the policy.

I happen to know that in the coal fields absenteeism is cutting production in most of the mines. It is straight absenteeism, not due to sickness, but due to laying off.

B. Conferences should be arranged with labor and management and local and State officials to obtain suspension or revision of any work rules, contract provisions, trade practices or usages, or statutory provisions which act as a curb on production. Examples are some of the extremely short hauls between division points on railroads which under present contracts constitute a full day's work for the train crew, the limitation of soft coal miners to 35 hours per week, and the restrictions on most effective utilization of labor in the construction field in building trades contracts, which by minute assignment of certain work to certain crafts sometimes requires the services of three or four men to do a job that one could do more quickly alone.

C. The workweek should be lengthened to at least 48 hours wherever practicable and

any additional overtime wages which are paid should be required to be paid in War bonds cashable only at the end of the war and to be used during the war only to pay Federal taxes. Suspending the 40-hour week in non-war industries, with the proviso that employers be permitted to pay overtime to the extent paid in 1942, should be studied as a possible answer to severe labor shortages in our civilian industries.

D. Labor hoarding should be stopped. Because of the difficulty of obtaining labor and because in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts the extra cost is borne by the Government and is no bar to the practice, many war contractors have employed men weeks and even months before they had work for them to do.

Mr. President, I personally saw a plant with 17,000 men on the pay roll and 12,000 workers. If that is not labor hoarding I do not know how it could be described.

The practice has been especially prevalent in the construction field, where in some cases it savors of racketeering. This not only wastes manpower, but has an extremely bad effect on public morale, undermining confidence in the whole war effort. The Subcommittee on Manpower believes that the most practical way to prevent this is for the Defense Plant Corporation and the contracting officers in the services to refuse to allow as reimbursable costs wages paid to labor which has not been used effectively. We strongly urge such action immediately by Defense Plant Corporation, the War and Navy Departments, Maritime Commission, and other governmental agencies.

E. Insofar as is possible, essential civilian production should be concentrated in those localities where there is large unemployment but which are unsuited for war contracts. New York City is an outstanding example of this sort of problem—

New York City has a gigantic labor pool with nothing to do; many other localities are in the same shape, while others have been overloaded with war factories—

and the War Production Board has plenty of power, through its control of priorities, to make it effective at once.

F. War production expansion should be planned so as to utilize or convert existing plants to the maximum possible, and new construction should be cut to the limit. Every time a new war plant is built, while an existing civilian plant is closed down for lack of orders, the manpower problem is complicated because the new plant requires a shift of workers, creating endless problems of housing, schools, and utilities and requiring the wasteful use of scarce materials and labor in new construction.

G. Relief employment on Work Projects Administration and similar programs should be cut drastically or eliminated entirely. Any person refusing to accept or continue work on a job he is capable of performing should be ineligible to receive any kind of relief or work relief.

H. The full skill and abilities of each worker should be absorbed. Easy jobs should be reserved for elder men and women. Students on vacation should be employed on seasonal jobs, particularly in agriculture, rather than being given permanent jobs for a temporary time. In every instance effort should be made to put the most able workers in the hardest jobs, providing a maximum of jobs to be filled by older women.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to file the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.



## REDUCTION OF DRAFT AGE LIMIT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7528) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on many occasions heretofore I have addressed the Senate, but certainly never before under such circumstances as I speak today. This hour finds the United States and almost all the other nations of the earth locked in a battle to the death. This hour finds the Army and Navy of the United States under the greatest test in their history. It finds our vast industrial system pitted against the factories of our enemies in turning out instruments of war on an unprecedented scale. And because the first year of war has taken its greatest toll of our naval forces, this hour finds the United States building the mightiest naval armada the world has ever seen—an armada which will decide whether we and our children shall continue to be able to pursue the way of life on which this great country has been built. That is why I feel that this is a most critical hour.

During the past few months, it has been difficult for all of us, even for those of us who are close to those who are directing the conduct of the war, to think clearly of what has happened. But for the past 20 years, as United States Secretary of Labor, as a long-time member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and as a Member of the United States Senate, I have had a personal interest in the development of our armed forces during peacetime, and in their performance in the present war. Within the past few days I have had particular reason to recall to mind our country's preparation for war—or rather the lack of it—since the time of the last war.

It is ironical that this year, 1942, should go down in history as one of the bloodiest and most tragic in the history of our country, for I recall that the year 1942 was looked forward to by all the leaders of a generation ago as a landmark of a far different sort. Nineteen hundred and forty-two was to be the year when the ideal of peace by universal trust and universal disarmament reached its final culmination—the year when naval armaments were finally to reach stabilization on the basis of fixed ratios, as determined by the Washington Naval Treaty.

In the light of terrible headlines that have screamed at us from the Nation's newspapers, I have had reason to think back to those peaceful days. I find it hard to recall how logical our dreams of a friendly family of nations seemed in those days. We have learned since then so much in the bitter school of experience.

I think it will help us to understand what has happened and what is now happening to recall briefly something of this vanished age. Only by understanding what has gone before can we see present battles in their true perspective, and guard against repeating our former mistakes when this bloody war is over.

Let me go back to one crisp morning in November 1921, when I attended a meeting of the great naval powers of the world in old Continental Hall here in Washington. The big room was filled with black-coated diplomats and admirals and Army officers who were gathered to discuss a problem which loomed large in the minds not alone of the American people but of the people of the world, the problem of ending the naval armament race which threatened eventually to destroy the peace hard won 3 years before. The time for that meeting was picked with an eye to its dramatic value. Fresh in my mind that morning—and surely in the minds of many other delegates gathered in the hall—were the impressive ceremonies of the day before, Armistice Day 1921. On that Armistice Day, in my official capacity as Secretary of Labor, I had joined the long parade of vehicles and people that thronged over the Highway Bridge over the Potomac to Arlington Cemetery, where the grave of America's Unknown Soldier was dedicated. On that day the memories of the tragedy of the war of 1914-18 were fresh in the mind of everyone who saw and heard that ceremony.

So, at the naval conference the next morning there was not a delegate present who did not have a deep desire to avoid a repetition of that tragedy. It was then that the then Secretary of State, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, rose and made some of the most startling proposals which were ever suggested. They involved a sharp cut in the size of the world's great navies, equalizing those of Great Britain and the United States, and stabilizing that of Japan. But there was no dissenting as he spoke. Secretary Hughes drew not only tears, but cheers when he spoke with passion and feeling of the day when the principles of peace would again rule the world.

I remember that scene as if it were yesterday. When the Hughes proposals were finally adopted, the people of Great Britain and the United States hailed the action sincerely and enthusiastically as the final solution to the problem of recurring war. It is safe to say, however, that Japan scowled at that conference the seeds of treachery which bore fruit 22 years later at Pearl Harbor, at Singapore, in the Dutch East Indies, and in Burma. Great Britain gave up forever her traditional position as possessor of the greatest navy in the world. We abandoned a navy building program which would have put us, in the course of time, in the lead among the world's great naval powers. True, Japan agreed to accept a navy limited to 60 percent of those of Great Britain and the United States. But she used that concession, which she never expected to live up to in the first place, to wring from Great Britain and the United States still other advantages in her favor. We agreed not to fortify the islands in her vicinity, and we signed with Japan the Nine Power Treaty, agreeing to respect the integrity of China. All of this tended simply to allay the suspicions of the world's great democracies and to keep them from sending military power into the Orient until Japan herself was sufficiently pow-

erful to launch a campaign of aggression and terror.

As the result of the Washington Treaty, the United States voluntarily sunk a mighty navy. She scrapped more than 842,000 tons of naval vessels built and building, including 19 battleships already built and 11 other capital ships under construction. Thus for world peace we gave up more than any other power.

The Washington Naval Treaty looked like a magnificent forward step in world peace at that time. The only trouble was that Japan's concessions were only in the form of words, while those of the United States were in the form of great ships of the line reduced to hunks of useless steel on the scrap heap.

New difficulties arose rapidly; so in 1927 we tried again with another conference at Geneva, Switzerland. The first conference had failed to set a limit on the construction of any except capital ships. The conference at Geneva sought a formula to apply to cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. But no agreement could be reached, and the conference failed.

However, that same year—1927—a bill was passed authorizing the construction of 10 cruisers. In 1929, 15 additional cruisers were authorized. The London Conference reduced the number of cruisers to 18. We again deferred to Japan and Great Britain.

The result of the London conference was a treaty which limited the tonnage of smaller ships to a 5-5-3 ratio for Great Britain, the United States, and Japan, respectively. How Japan must have laughed. Already she was building with headlong speed for her attack on China. While all the rest of the civilized world hailed the London naval treaty as the climax of an era of aggression, as a milestone in the history of civilization, Japan laughed up her voluminous sleeve, for she knew that this treaty was the grave-stone of all our hopes.

The United States, meanwhile, was pursuing the path of peace. Not only had we led in pressing low limits for our own and other navies, but we did not then even avail ourselves of the right to build within those limits. We wanted to show the world an example of a great nation willing to put her trust in good will rather than in the sword. Between 1922 and 1932 Great Britain built 112 warships. Japan constructed no less than 126 announced vessels, besides those she was building secretly. She also fortified her possessions in the Pacific. She was building stepping stones for offensive action against America and Great Britain. But during the same 10-year period the United States laid down keels for only 36 vessels. At the same time we even supplied the iron and steel scrap and the rolling mills and other machinery with which our enemy Japan was building, and furnished her the oil to store up for future use against us. While Japan was storing up oil for her use she was complaining about the United States storing oil in Hawaii. I saw this happening, but I could do nothing but look futilely on and hope for the best.

In January 1932 Senator Hale of Maine, then chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, introduced Senate bill 51, authorizing the building up of the Navy to the strength permitted by the Washington and London naval treaties. This bill passed the Senate on May 6, 1932, but did not become a law, as the House of Representatives failed to pass it.

While we helped our enemies to build, the Navy of the United States—the world's greatest nation—dropped to a poor third place among the world's maritime powers.

In late 1931 the present World War in which we are now engaged began. This war began the day Japan marched into Manchuria that September. That was the first chapter in the new story of world violence and aggression. As a result of the Manchuria incident, bills were introduced and passed on to both Chambers of Congress by their Naval Affairs Committees to bring the Navy to full treaty strength. But the United States still looked the other way; the bills failed to pass.

I may say in passing that the present chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who succeeded Senator Hale as chairman, gave his wholehearted support to the program of naval expansion, and he piloted through the Senate the 20 Percent Expansion Act of 1938, the 11 Percent Expansion Act of 1940, the Two-Ocean Navy Act of 1940, and many other recent acts. Today the authorized strength of our Navy is about five times the treaty strength.

Returning to my theme, when Senate bill 51 failed to pass the House, at that particular time in Germany a fanatical Hitler seized power. In Asia Japan continued to absorb Manchuria, heedless of the world's futile criticisms, unsupported by action. Finally, in the United States we realized that we must act and act swiftly. And we acted. On June 16, 1933, the President was authorized to allot money for the construction of vessels within the terms of the London Naval Treaty. Moving swiftly, we apportioned \$238,000,000 for the construction of 23 ships, including 2 aircraft carriers, 4 cruisers, 20 destroyers, and 4 submarines. During the next year further steps were taken. The Vinson-Trammell Act of March 1934 provided for the construction of other new cruisers and sufficient auxiliary ships to bring the Navy to treaty strength. Moreover, it gave legal sanction to the policy of replacing over-age ships when they became too obsolete to be effective.

But this was no time to rest content with what we had done. Our "friends" in Europe and Asia were at work in earnest now. This, mind you, Mr. President, was in 1934, when we thought our greatest dangers were economic perils from within. We were at peace with Germany, Italy, and Japan. They were our friends. Our Government leaned over backward to avoid offending them. Yet, secretly, cloaked by America's naive conception of international friendship—something which simply did not exist—these powers were bending every effort to prepare for a mighty war to bring us to defeat. Ger-

many had already begun construction of pocket battleships of the *Deutschland* class.

The Italian Government announced the construction of new battleships. In December, Japan gave formal notice that she would no longer be bound by the London and Washington agreements. Three months afterward, Germany openly repudiated the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles and served notice that she was beginning to construct submarines.

Did we see in those small beginnings the great fleets of undersea raiders which were to send hundreds of American merchant ships to the bottom, together with the Americans aboard, or the German naval power that was to strike at Norway, at Britain, and at our own convoys, or Japan's immense naval power that was to reach its long tentacles as far as Hawaii and the Aleutians in the eastern Pacific, and was to envelop the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies, Malaya, and Burma to the south? Perhaps we did not grasp these dreadful portents, but we did go hard at work on 24 vessels under the Vinson plan. At the same time the Army was authorized to establish air bases on the Aleutian Islands.

We made one more pitiful attempt to salvage something from the ruins of the Washington Treaty. Late in 1935 a new naval conference was called in London. It met, ironically enough, on December 7, a day which 6 years later was to bring to a disastrous close the hopes of the United States for peace by disarmament. But by December 1935 the peoples of Germany and Italy and Japan had placed their destiny in the hands of men drunk with lust for power.

The conference was a failure; and the aggressor nations continued their plunder of the world. Italy turned her military machine loose against the almost defenseless natives of Ethiopia. Germany reoccupied the Rhineland. Germany and Italy cut their teeth on the war in Spain. Japan waged war on China proper, and finally the so-called anticomintern pact was signed, and by it was born the monstrous Axis which was to menace civilization itself.

In March 1938 Japanese flyers gave us a preview of what was in store for us by bombing and sinking the United States gunboat *Panay* in the Yangtze River. Japan said, "So sorry." A year later German militarism swept over Austria.

Some of us here within our secure borders began to realize that this was all one war. We began to realize that the United States might indeed be in danger, fantastic as such a thought might seem. So in May 1938 Congress again took action. It passed a second Vinson Act, authorizing a 20-percent increase in the United States Navy and a further increase in the naval air force by 3,000 planes. I was on the Senate Naval Affairs Committee at that time, and it was with great gratification that I saw our Navy begin to acquire muscles—fighter's muscles, capable of throwing knockout punches.

Munich came and went.

Czechoslovakia fell.

Finally on September 1, 1939, all Europe burst into flames.

Abruptly America opened its eyes to the possibility of those flames sweeping even to its own inviolable shores. In 1939 Congress pushed forward, at a greatly accelerated pace, the preparedness program on land, sea, and air. We backed, to a man, the President's forceful declaration committing the Nation to defend, at any cost, the territory and institutions of the New World.

The first consideration for the Senate Naval Affairs Committee was to build a Navy commensurate with the demands which it was feared might be imposed upon it. So immediately after the war broke out in Europe Congress passed the Eleven Percent Expansion Act and the Seventy Percent Expansion Act. These were followed by five other authorizations providing for a two-ocean Navy and a modern fleet of 3,750,000 tons.

Since then, and supplementing this vast increase, Congress has passed further bills authorizing construction of more than 3,000,000 additional tons. Of the 60,000-plane program for 1942 and the 125,000-plane program for 1943, the Navy is receiving a substantial allotment. Legislation passed only recently provided an additional sum of almost \$4,000,000,000 for naval aviation. Thus Congress has insured a Navy of almost 7,000,000 tons—a 5-ocean Navy—a Navy that will have adequate ships and planes of every type to secure the overwhelming superiority on the sea and in the air, which must be achieved to bring about the final and utter downfall of our enemies.

Mr. President, ships alone do not make a Navy, for ships are useless without the bases that furnish them their fuel, their food, and the ammunition with which to fight. So important are bases that under certain circumstances a single base may be worth a hundred ships. The United States recognized this, and recognized its own lack of bases all too well. So in 1940, one of the greatest forward steps in the development of American sea power was taken when we traded to Great Britain 50 over-age flush-deck World War destroyers in return for a ring of mighty bases, stretching from Newfoundland in the north to British Guiana in the south. In the words of the President, it was an "epochal and far-reaching act of preparation for continental defense in the face of grave danger."

Those bases have already proved vital safeguards of our chain of supplies to our outposts in Iceland and Ireland, and to our English and Russian allies. They may well prove to be the saviors of the Panama Canal and a major aid in eliminating the submarine menace which has threatened our coastal lifelines.

So far, I have talked mainly of the Navy because the Navy was the first consideration, our first line of defense. But at the same time the Navy was growing in strength, factories from one end of the country to the other were being built or converted to the production of planes, tanks, and guns for the waging of land warfare on a scale never before conceived in our history.

I have described the battle for American naval and military supremacy on land, on sea, and in the air as I have seen



it fought and won in the halls of Congress during the past decade.

I have reason to remember that battle, for I followed every phase of it personally, from the Washington Disarmament Conference in 1921 to the most recent arms appropriation. My only hope is that this intimate personal experience may help me better to judge the steps that must be taken in the future.

So far I have spoken of a Navy that existed largely as an instrument of national policy. It was conceived by most people to be a force that was to ride the waves, close to American shores, in one ocean or the other, and by the mere existence of its ships, planes, and guns, was to leave Hitler and Yamamoto shaking in their boots.

But what of that Navy in action? What of our ships and men on the high seas, facing murderous salvos from below the horizon, facing streaking torpedoes from hidden submarines, facing screaming bombs from the death-laden skies overhead? What of this Navy, created in the halls of Congress, when it finally came within gun range or plane range of the Germans and the Japanese? Let me take a few moments to trace the world-shaking events of the first year of the greatest war in which we have ever been engaged.

War actually began for the United States on September 4, 1941, when our destroyer *Greer*, carrying mail and supplies to Iceland, detected a German submarine lurking ahead in waters vital to American defense. The *Greer* forged ahead nevertheless, and when within range of the submarine saw two torpedoes streaking toward it. The *Greer* avoided the two torpedoes and counter-attacked with depth charges. From that incident forward the Navy was ordered to "shoot on sight."

On the inky night of October 16, the war was brought home in earnest to the Navy. The destroyer *Kearny*, answering a call from a convoy attacked by a pack of U-boats, was torpedoed without warning at close range. Eleven men lost their lives in the explosion, and the entire ship would have been lost had she not been one of the newest design, with compartmentation which kept her afloat until she could be repaired. Two weeks later to the day the most savage blow of all was struck. Steaming alone south and west of Iceland, the 21-year-old destroyer *Reuben James* was struck without warning by an enemy torpedo. She had none of the advantages that were built into the *Kearny*. Her entire forward half exploded and sank at once, taking 100 officers and men with it.

This, mind you, was when we were still at peace. No war had been declared between our Government and that of Germany. Yet Germany had struck treacherously and savagely; and the water-soaked bodies of scores of brave American sailors were the price paid for America's boast that war could be kept from her shores by simple faith in honor between nations. It seems incredible now that so many people in this great land could be numb to the fires of aggression that were licking at our shores. And yet people said it was 1917 all over again.

Some destroyers were lost in the stormy Atlantic transporting goods to England. That was all. This was a little backyard squabble which we could win with our left hand.

Then it came.

December 7, 1941. On that day the United States of America was hurled by an act of perfidious treachery into the greatest war the world has ever seen—a war not on one ocean, or on two, but on the seven seas of the earth; a war not in one country or on one continent, but on all the continents of the globe; a war which has already cost the United States Navy more lives than all the previous wars in its history, and which has cost the United States Army more casualties—killed, wounded, or missing—than the total number of American soldiers killed in action in World War No. 1.

This was the reply of the peoples we had trusted. This was the price we paid for heeding their solemn entreaties to discuss peace. Only then did we of the United States—believers in human decency and the fraternity of man—believe that civilized people could use peace agreements to build for war. We were still talking peace in the light of amity and trust when the Japanese planes roared out of the darkness of night to rain death and destruction on American soil.

What viler act can any man commit than complete degradation of professed friendship? To this very hour the fiends are exhibiting the same inhuman treachery they displayed on December 7. Time and time again in the Solomon Islands they have displayed the white flag of truce, which has been recognized and honored by fighting men since the beginning of human warfare, and they have used that flag as a means of drawing American forces into death traps. Vermin capable of such fiendish desecration of human decency must be exterminated from the face of the earth.

Mr. President, after that first stunning blow, through the bleak and dragging weeks of December and January and even into February and March, the Navy was the target for endless storms of the most acrimonious criticism—criticism from the man in the street, from the Nation's press, and even from some Members of Congress itself. But I think we realize now that all that criticism was the result of a great and foolish error—the underestimation of Japan and the lack of realization of the gigantic scale of this global war.

Americans are unaccustomed to the bitter gall of defeat. It is no wonder that many were unnerved by the steady succession of bad news and failed to see the picture clearly. Let me tell you, though, Mr. President, that I personally did not rail at the Navy with fruitless gibes during these dark hours. Perhaps this was because my own son was seeing active service on the high seas; but I like to think it was because, as a member of long standing of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, I knew what we were up against in a war with the Empire of Japan. I had seen them buy our rolling mills and scrap to make their steel; and every time a bill for our own naval ex-

pansion came up we had to consider the rumors of our potential enemy's secret building program. I knew that, magnificent as our Navy might be, we could not defeat Japan in 2 weeks or 2 months, and perhaps not in 2 years.

I knew that because I could see that, with Pearl Harbor, we had been plunged into a war for which there was no precedent in all history. This was global war—a new concept. To land on the enemy's coasts, against murderous fire—the most difficult of all military operations—to fight on every continent and every island of the world, to win control of those lands and of the air above them—this was the Army's responsibility. To win complete control of every foot of every sea the world around, and to control every foot of the skies above those seas—this was the Navy's responsibility. But it was the Navy's responsibility, as well, to see that every man and every scrap of material destined to carry on the fight on land reached their destination safely, and to maintain constant streams of supplies to American outposts the world around. To build up new bases from trackless jungle, to design and rush the completion of new ships by the thousands, to recruit and train 30,000 pilots and hundreds of thousands of officers and seamen each year, and to protect every inch of the 16,000 miles of coastline of the United States and her possessions—these, too, were the Navy's responsibilities. This, indeed, was a task without precedent in the history of war.

But, it may be asked, What is the point of talking about responsibilities? The acid test, the only test, is in actual results. How have we come out in the actual engagements? Very well, let us count off those engagements. Let us mark them up on the scoreboard of history.

Pearl Harbor: A stunning, crushing blow which failed in its prime purpose, which was to cripple forever our Pacific sea power, but which nevertheless must be classed as a tragic defeat.

Macassar Straits: A surprise sortie, in which a daring force of United States destroyers cut into a huge Japanese convoy, sinking five transports and throwing the escorting warships into complete confusion before our forces dashed away unscathed.

The Gilbert and Marshall Islands raids: Surprise blows of reprisal for Pearl Harbor, brilliantly conceived and executed.

The Coral Sea: Although we lost the *Lexington*, this 5-day battle was the first major set-back of the Japanese in their march of aggression in the South Pacific. We sank or crippled no less than 20 Japanese ships—a victory that set the Japs back 2 months in their anticipated assault against Australia.

Midway: The most significant, the most glorious triumph of the war in the Pacific—4 Japanese carriers sunk, with at least 275 planes destroyed, together with their crews; 2 or 3 battleships damaged, one severely; 2 cruisers sunk, and 4 more damaged; 3, and possibly 4, destroyers sunk, a blow from which Japan will never fully recover. We did not realize the enormous importance of the

Battle of Midway when the results were first announced, but we realize today that the Japanese Fleet which was stopped was no mere raiding task force. It was a major invasion fleet whose destination was not the sandy little scrap of land that is Midway, but was Hawaii itself. The Battle of Midway can be compared only to the Battle of Salamis, which saved ancient Greece from an alien invasion; or, in our own history, it might be compared to the taking of Ticonderoga and the turning back of Britain's invasion fleet on Lake Champlain in the Revolutionary War. That engagement, while seemingly no tremendous victory in itself, not only saved our struggling Colonial government from immediate annihilation at the hands of a stronger British force but made possible the later triumph at Saratoga, which was the true and final decisive battle of the war.

The Solomons: The battle for the Solomons marked the beginning of our offensive in the Pacific. The cost to us in ships and men has been severe, but so long as the gallant marines and soldiers hold our positions there, and the naval vessels and Army bombers continue to make it possible for them to hold, the Battle of the Solomons must be marked on the scoreboard of history as an American success.

These have been the major fighting engagements at sea, and I ask the Senate to look at the score. Five spectacular successes to two set-backs—five victories as against two defeats. And this score, mind you, Mr. President, does not take into consideration the damage inflicted by those other two intrepid sea services, the submarines and the motor torpedo boats. Let us not forget to pay tribute to them. Working alone and against tremendous odds, they have added scores of sinkings to our toll.

On land, it is no secret that this first year of war has been a year of tragic and bloody defeats. But in those defeats there was glory, for to the tradition of America they added exploits of individual heroism that are unsurpassed. We lost Wake Island, but we gained an example of fearlessness that will leave men misty-eyed so long as they can remember. We lost Bataan, but we gained a spectacle of dogged last-ditch courage against fearful odds that will live in our hearts beside the Alamo.

In land warfare, this has been a year of preparation. It has been a year in which to complete our vast training camps, to pour forth arms and uniforms and equipment to supply our soldiers—a year in which to train officers and get our Selective Service machinery running smoothly, and build up nuclei for new kinds of fighting groups. It has been a year in which to turn freedom-loving civilians into fighting men, capable of meeting and defeating the enemy wherever he may be.

The results of this year's work will be seen in next year's headlines.

Every Member of the Senate must feel the tension of this moment. This is the turning point. This is the crucial and precious moment which will decide whether America is worthy to continue enjoying the freedom which she has al-

ways held dear. America's appointment with destiny is here. Will we meet it? The demands of war have reached out to envelop all of us. There is probably not a family in America that has not been affected by the war in many ways during this first fateful year. But the time has now come when the demands of the war reach out to all Americans. The time has come when our youth—our lads of 18 and 19 years of age—must go forth to fight for the world they will live in. It is no longer enough for us to give up our pleasure driving, give up our five cups of coffee a day, our meat 7 days a week, our scrap for the steel mills, and our money for War bonds. Now we must give our sons. My boy is already serving his country on a warship on the high seas, as are the sons of countless thousands of other families throughout the land. The time has come when they must now be joined by their former schoolmates and companions in the one great fight against the powers of oppression.

I do not say these things without the most deliberate thought. I am one of those who opposed the peacetime Selective Service Act when it was first proposed. I think to this day that the difference of opinion on that first draft bill was justified because of the conditions in the country at that time. I knew then that our Government was burdened with the support of a great body of unemployed—able-bodied unemployed—from which, I believed, the Army would be able to recruit voluntarily a skeleton organization. Then when the exigencies of war or national defense made it necessary, it seemed to me that it would be possible to build a citizen army around this nucleus. I was not against the draft per se. I simply believed that we could approach the problem by a different means.

But I want to stress that, although I voted against the peacetime draft, I now say that it is absolutely essential for the security of our country and the winning of this war that all available young men between 18 and 20 years of age be inducted into the United States Army for training immediately, without delay.

Let me state why it is necessary. This is not a war of physical brawn, in which the winning or the losing depends upon the muscles of a warrior swinging a battle ax or broadsword. This is a war of machines; of speed and power and precision; of stamina and coordination. This is a war of machines, and it must be fought by youths who have grown up with machines, and who have lived with machines since their babyhood. It takes a young man to shoot straight and true in a tank speeding and bouncing over rough terrain at 40 miles an hour. It takes a young man to stand the terrific beating dealt out by a roaring motor torpedo boat. It takes a young man to win a modern aerial dog fight. In today's air warfare, a flyer's life depends on his ability to make decisions in one-seventy-fifth of a second, spitting hot lead into the plane in front of his sights, while he eludes the enemy plane on his tail, streaking through the air all the while at the speed of a bullet. This is no game

for the men of 30, softened by years of desk work. And it is no game for the men of 23 or 25, who have too often left the football field and basketball court behind for adding machines and cocktail lounges. No; modern war is a game for the youths who are keen of eye, quick in mind, and coordinated in every muscle and sinew of their bodies.

The Navy has known this for a long time. For the last 50 years, war at sea has been a war of machines, and the Navy has known that it must be fought by young men. The average age of the enlisted man in the Navy right now is under 20 years of age.

The time has come for all of us to realize that this must be the age for the soldiers, as well as the sailors, who will win this war.

The Army and the Navy of today are as different from those of 1918 as those of the First World War were from the rabble of the Crusades. What we must realize is that the Army and the Navy of today are, in reality, great educational institutions. From the standpoint of number of classrooms involved, number of instructors at work, variety of training given, and number of students enrolled, the United States Army and the United States Navy are the largest institutions of education and training in the entire world. For this is a war of specialization. No longer is a man just a sailor, or just a soldier. He is a technician, an expert. He is a radioman, or a machinist, or a photographer, or an electrician, or a signalman, or a hospitalman. He is a navigator, or a weather forecaster, or a pilot, or an ordnance expert. He is a driver, or a mechanic, or a storekeeper, or a cook, or a metalsmith.

The Army and the Navy will give the young man an education in one of these or many other specialized fields before he is ever sent to a fighting front. They will help fit him as an individual into civilian as well as military life. And the adjustment back again from military into civilian life, with the return of peace, will be easier after this war than was true at the end of any war that has ever been waged.

More than that, the Army and the Navy will teach our boys discipline at a time when it will mean more to them than any other time in their lives. They will teach them cooperation with their fellow man, and will encourage them to display every innate quality of leadership they may possess. And they will build in them sound and sturdy bodies. Throughout their military careers they will be given the best food and quartered in the cleanest and most livable quarters that can be obtained.

Mind you, Mr. President, I know what I am talking about. I have seen what the Navy has done to my own son, Jim. And I know what he thinks of that service. Take the matter of food. The last time he came home from sea duty I said to him, "Well, son, how does the grub on your ship compare with the food here at home?" He replied, "To be honest, Dad, I don't get devil's food cake like mother used to make—we don't get very fancy stuff—but it's the kind of darned good food that sticks to your ribs."



When our boys go out to fight they will go with an Army or Navy that has already tasted victory. By the time our boys ever get to a fighting front the tide will have turned. The battles of our first year have not gone well. We have been slow to put the enemy on the run. But we have sacrificed possible minor victories this first year for something far more essential to final, complete victory. We have built from the ground. We have prepared ourselves for any eventuality, and no United States force will be sent to face the enemy without a vast abundance of the finest equipment and the finest arms that American ingenuity and the resources of American industry can turn out. We have been slow, but we have built fighting forces against which no evil powers in all the world can long endure.

Mr. President, what of the peace that will follow the victory of the United Nations and the United States? The President has already made it clear that the criminal leaders of the aggressor nations will be made to answer for their inhuman crimes, and we may be sure that only the most practical considerations, guided by our memories of the bloodshed that was forced upon us, and not any false conceptions of idealism, will dictate our terms of peace. The brutality, the bestial cruelty that has been inflicted on the innocent populations of Poland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, China—yes, and upon our own citizens who have been so unfortunate as to fall into the hands of the enemy—will not encourage us to handle the Nazi and Nipponese war leaders with kid gloves.

I hope that the peace to follow this war will be an insured peace. It will be a lasting peace, because the peace-loving nations of the world will back their peace by force. I do not like the expression, "Policing the world," but I do know that we who believe in man's right to freedom and decency must make sure, by every means at hand, that innocent people who want only to live and work undisturbed shall never again feel the tyrant's iron heel or stinging lash.

This means that America must never again put her trust in disarmament, in any form. If my past 22 years in our Government have taught me any one thing, it is that there are always nations in the world so perfidious as to use a semblance of peace to prepare for hideous war. I am a firm believer in the old saying that if a man fools me once, it is his fault; but if he fools me twice, it is my fault. We were fooled once into scraping our Navy and reducing our Army to the size of that of Switzerland; but after this war we are going to match America's true greatness and her position in the family of nations with a might on land and sea in keeping with that greatness, and that will insure the permanence of our position among the family of nations.

In the jubilation of the armistice that will some day come, let us pause to remember how difficult was this hour, and how we were brought to this dark hour; and let us make sure, on that future victorious day, that our present hard sacrifices are not made meaningless by the blunders of tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the remarks of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as to the matter of deferment of men engaged in agricultural pursuits, and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota whether he would be kind enough to give his interpretation of paragraph (k), particularly with reference to whether or not, if the report shall be adopted, it will result in freezing farm labor.

Mr. GURNEY. In reply to the inquiry directed to me by the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to say that paragraph (k) has to do with the deferment of men engaged in essential agriculture and men necessary to essential agriculture. This is known in the Senate as the Tydings amendment. It was adopted on the floor of the Senate by a vote of about 67 to 6, and therefore the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House had no particular choice in the matter. It was a mandate from the Senate by an overwhelming vote to retain this provision in the bill.

After talking the matter over in conference, the House conferees thought well of the amendment, and the conferees of the House of Representatives also thought well of it, as was indicated in the large vote of acceptance in the House day before yesterday.

So far as I am aware, it is not supposed this provision will result in a freezing of farm labor. Paragraph (k) merely defers those necessary to and regularly engaged in essential agriculture, and under it they would be deferred only when a local board otherwise would induct them. As I understand, no evidence was given before the Committee on Military Affairs or the conferees to the effect that it would result in a freezing of agricultural labor. It merely provides for deferment of those who would otherwise be immediately inducted by the local boards of the Selective Service. Does that answer the question?

Mr. LANGER. It answers the question. As I understand, the local board is not to be final?

Mr. GURNEY. The local board is not to be final on this particular phase of selective service, or any other phase of it. There is always opportunity for a registrant to appeal to the State board, and then on up to the President, if he so wishes.

Mr. LANGER. If the report shall be adopted, that opportunity will still exist?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; and it is so stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask specifically about this matter. As I understand the amendment, if a farm laborer is classified in 3-A by reason of having dependents, then the amendment would not apply to him, and he would be free to leave his service and go into industrial occupations if he wished to do so. Is that a correct interpretation of the subsection?

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure it is. I am sure that the sense of the amendment itself, and all the evidence before the committee, is to the effect that it would defer

a man only if he were deferred solely because of being engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?  
Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator construe this amendment as adding any authority to the draft boards which they did not already possess?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not.

Mr. PEPPER. Then what is the good of it? If it does not give them any power or authority which they do not already have, what is the purpose of it?

Mr. GURNEY. That, I am sure, could be more thoroughly explained by the author of the amendment, which was adopted by the entire Senate, and at the time it was adopted I am sure the same authority existed to issue the directives which had been issued by the national headquarters of the selective service.

Mr. PEPPER. Then if it were left out, if the Senate were not to agree to the conference report with this language in it, and if, by subsequent conference action it were left out, so far as the able Senator in charge of the bill knows, no disservice would be done to agriculture?

Mr. GURNEY. The provision confirms regulations already issued by the selective service. It puts in the law authority for regulations already issued under direction of the President through the selective service.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean to say that prior to the directive of the War Manpower Commission, to which he has referred, there was no authority in the draft boards to make these deferments?

Mr. GURNEY. Oh yes, there was authority to do things like this, among other powers which have not been exercised by the selective-service headquarters. In other words, under the original Selective Service Act, the President, through his Administrator of selective service, was authorized to issue regulations, and under those powers deferment has already been ordered of those essential for the production of necessary food products.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator construe the directive of the War Manpower Commission as compulsory and authoritative and binding upon selective-service boards or local draft boards?

Mr. GURNEY. No, I do not. I believe that the directive from Washington gave the local board members something on which to hang a hat, for instance.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator regard the language of the bill dealing with this subject, that is, paragraph (k), as binding and authoritative upon the draft boards?

Mr. GURNEY. It is binding on the draft boards, but discretionary with the local draft boards with respect to their findings as to whether or not that plan is absolutely essential.

Mr. PEPPER. I believe the able Senator stated that the provision did not apply to 3-A men. Is there anything in the language to indicate that?

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. PEPPER. I understood the able Senator, in reply to the question of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], to say that this provision did not, for example, forbid a 3-A man from bettering himself in some other industry. Is there anything in the text of the measure which justifies the Senator in making that statement?

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure there is. There is nothing in paragraph (k) of this amendment which freezes any agricultural laborers. It defers them only from immediate induction provided they otherwise would be subject to immediate call.

Mr. PEPPER. May I call the able Senator's attention to the following language in paragraph (k):

*Provided, That should any such person—*

"Such person" evidently refers to "every registrant found by a selective service local board \* \* \* to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation." In other words, the type of selectee to which reference is made is the registrant, and that is the only qualification that I see in the first part of paragraph (k). It says—

Every registrant found by a selective service local board.

Three-A's are registrants, are they not?

Mr. GURNEY. It says "registrants," but every bit of evidence was to the effect that it affected only those who were immediately liable for induction.

Mr. PEPPER. I started to call the able Senator's attention to the following language in paragraph (k):

*Provided, That should any such person—*

That is any registrant mentioned in the first line of paragraph (k).

Mr. GURNEY. I may interrupt there to say that "such person" means one who has previously been deferred from immediate induction because of necessary agricultural occupation.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator does not mean that this provision is limited only to those who have previously been deferred by the draft board, does he?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is talking now about the man who might leave a place where he has been employed, and because he had previously been employed in a necessary agricultural occupation, he has secured deferment from his local board. Therefore, I conclude that if he tried to change his status, and moved to another location, he would have to receive the approval of his local board which had previously given him deferment.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I read the language in paragraph (k):

*Provided, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a)*

*(2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.*

I ask the able Senator from South Dakota if a worker in a factory is today by statute subject to any such requirement or condition.

Mr. GURNEY. Is an industrial worker subject to immediate induction?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; if he goes from one job to another.

Mr. GURNEY. If he has previously been deferred because of his present occupation, and he moves to another industry which is not essential in the war effort, his deferment will be taken away from him.

Mr. PEPPER. Is there any statutory provision to that effect?

Mr. GURNEY. No; that is by regulation.

Mr. PEPPER. So we are by statute putting a farm worker in a category in which we do not put the industrial worker?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The conclusion therefore is that with respect to selective service and in respect to deferment we are dealing legislatively differently with the industrial worker than with the agricultural worker? That conclusion is inescapable, is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that we are herewith giving statutory deferment to the agricultural worker, the man necessary to and regularly engaged in essential agriculture and essential to the war effort.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator a moment before, I believe, said that we were not giving him statutory deferment because the discretion was still left in the draft board, but I assume that the Senator means to say that we are telling the draft board, "You shall defer agricultural workers whom you find to be necessary," but we are not telling the draft board to defer industrial workers whom they may find to be necessary; we are leaving that entirely to their discretion?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes, as I see it.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what we are doing, is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator think that this is the way the Congress ought to legislate on the matter of occupational deferments?

Mr. GURNEY. The committee did not recommend it, but the Senate adopted it. The Senator will remember that I was one of those who voted against this amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this amendment was initiated on the floor, was it not, by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings]? This deferment amendment was offered, not by the committee, as coming from the committee, but was offered on the floor by the able Senator from Maryland, was it not?

Mr. GURNEY. It was offered by the Senator from Maryland, and adopted with the support of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say that at the time the amendment

came up the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] will recall that I went to him, and I think the RECORD will show that the Senator from Florida was not on the floor when the amendment was agreed to. When I came on the floor and discovered it I went to the able Senator from Alabama and protested against the amendment, pointing out substantially what I have said today, and I think the able Senator from Alabama will attest that fact, if he recalls it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will attest that fact. The Senator from Florida recalls, though, that the amendment was put in by the Senate. It was not reported by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, but was put in the bill by the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, and if my memory serves me correctly, it was put into it by a vote of 62 to 6. Not only was it put in by an overwhelming vote, but we had what used to be called in the House of Representatives, a field day, Member after Member rising on the floor and speaking for the amendment, and expressing his approbation of the amendment, and hoping that the amendment would be adopted. But I attest what the Senator from Florida has said.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from South Dakota another question.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Florida if he desires.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President. I desired to make a word of comment, but I wanted to ask the able Senator about another matter. There has not been, then, except for the fact that this amendment was offered on the floor, an investigation of this subject by the Military Affairs Committee, or a particular study made of this subject of occupational deferment by the committee? In other words, the amendment is not the result of study made by the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. GURNEY. No; it is not. It was offered and initiated on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings].

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to say a word—

Mr. GURNEY. I may follow through on that, if the Senator will permit me. The committee did not offer this amendment or this idea, because they had considered it thoroughly in committee during the hearing, when the amendment was originally proposed, away back in September.

Mr. PEPPER. But the committee did not make a recommendation on the substance of this amendment to the Senate?

Mr. GURNEY. No; it did not.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized in his own right.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall not cover again the points I attempted to cover earlier today. I realize how anxious Congress



is to give some relief to agriculture in respect to the existing shortage of agricultural labor. When this amendment was adopted by the Senate the other day, frankly, I had not given careful attention to the proposal, but after it was adopted, or about the time the Senate adopted it, I know that I did give some attention to it, and I thought it was a mistake for the Senate or for the Congress to legislate at this time in this way on the question of occupational deferment.

I think the able Senator from South Dakota has already shown by his response that if this language were left out of the bill we would not deprive agriculture of substantial relief which will come, no doubt, by the directive of the War Manpower Commission, which the able Senator in charge of the bill on the floor says has already been issued—that is, a directive by the War Manpower Commission to the local draft boards to respect necessary occupations in agriculture with respect to deferment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to point out the correct status of the authority of any directive that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission might issue at the moment. I do not believe he has any authority, either by statute or by Executive order of the President, to issue a directive to selective service nationally or direct to the local boards all over the country.

Mr. PEPPER. At least a directive of the War Manpower Commission indicates the determination of policy which has been arrived at by the War Manpower directive. I think the Senator's statement is true, and I agree with its veracity, which shows how inadequately we have dealt with the handling of this difficult question of manpower. The Manpower Commission has no more power than to give a directive, which may or may not be persuasive upon the local draft boards on the question of the proper utilization of our manpower.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Florida has made what I consider to be technically a rather well-founded objection, on the ground that by statute we undertake to defer one class of workers and not another class. In a very broad sense, perhaps we ought to give consideration to the whole subject, and not do anything about it until we have reached a conclusion satisfactory to us.

However, I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the clamor about the deferment of agricultural workers was almost Nation-wide. I believe the main facts are conceded. We were taking away from the farms those who are called upon to produce food not only for our Army and for the civilian population, but who, perhaps within a year or so, will be called upon to produce food even for our enemies, after we shall have conquered them—at least for millions of neutrals who do not now

have, and within a year or two will not have, the facilities to produce the food necessary to avoid starvation.

While it seems to me that the Senator is perhaps technically correct, I believe that the Senate, in adopting this amendment by such an overwhelming vote, was responding to the cry from the country that the way our deferment had been handled, even though it was conscientiously and legally handled, we were bringing the country into such a position that we should be short of food, when everyone knows that without adequate labor we cannot produce enough food to meet the demand which is soon coming. Therefore, we felt justified in remedying the situation so far as we could. We attempted to meet a problem which to us appeared to be gigantic in its scope, namely, the problem of seeing to it that there was sufficient essential help on the farms to produce the food necessary to feed our civilian population, as well as our Army, which we must keep at the front.

It seemed to me—and I am still of the same opinion—that we were making a great mistake in depleting our farms of their herds and of the men who are necessary to maintain production. Even though the solution which we adopted might not be as good a way to meet the problem as though we should make a long study of it and include deferment of other classes, with respect to which no clamor arose and no claim of great injury was being made, as was true in the case of agricultural labor, it seems perfectly plain to me that when the situation was brought to our attention and the amendment was offered on the floor of the Senate, it was our patriotic duty to put something of that kind into the law. We may not have fully succeeded. It seems to me that we have done a pretty good job.

Does not the Senator from Florida believe that even though we might admit that the subject needs further consideration in regard to deferments of other classes, yet with respect to this particular outstanding class we were justified in doing something as quickly as possible? It seems to me that we should have done it a year ago.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Nebraska knows with what attentive and affectionate regard I listen to everything he says. Of course, there is much merit in what he says. As a lawyer, the Senator is familiar with the old adage that "hard cases make bad law."

The question in my mind, in balancing the interests of various groups, was whether this partial, inadequate, and in my opinion, unfair approach would do more harm than would be compensated for by the immediate good which it would accomplish. I do not quarrel with other Senators for having reached a different conclusion. I only regret that on the vital question of the use of manpower we think it is necessary to write into legislation not something which is the result of study by any committee or executive agency, but a proposal which emanates from a Senator on the floor of the Senate, and which has had no more consideration

than brief debate on the floor and certain consideration by the conferees before becoming the law of the land. I was afraid that the Congress, by becoming a party to that method of handling the problem, would only contribute to the inadequacy with which the whole subject has so far been dealt by the Government.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not recall whether the Senator from Florida was in the Chamber at the time the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland was thoroughly discussed. If he had been present at that time I believe he would recall that the seriousness of the farm situation and the dangerous food shortage threatening the Nation were well known to many Senators at that time, as was apparent from the debate, and that the amendment was therefore considered highly essential.

Furthermore, General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, had either asked that this legislation be enacted, or had heartily recommended the passage of the bill at that time. As stated by the Senator from Maryland, General Hershey desired that sort of legislation at that time. I presume the subject was thoroughly considered by General Hershey, and I am also inclined to believe that it must have had the consideration, either individually or as a group, of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, because the chairman of that committee, while opposed to adding any amendments to the bill, heartily approved this particular amendment and, as I understand, voted for it, making the vote almost unanimous.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator has just heard the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who was in charge of the bill, say that the amendment was not reported by the committee with the recommendation of the committee, and that he voted against the amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am not disagreeing with what the able Senator from Texas has suggested, namely, that there is a very serious shortage of manpower on farms; but I am not sure that the shortage is equally distributed over the agricultural areas. If there is to be deferment I am not sure that the men should necessarily be deferred where they are, and I am not sure that they should be "frozen" into their present jobs. I still insist that under the proposed amendment they would be so "frozen," because if they should leave their jobs they would be put into the Army by the selective service board. I do not believe it is fair for farm workers to be "frozen" into their jobs without the Government, through some agency, seeing to it that the conditions under which they work comply with certain minimum requirements, as well as some minimum of sufficiency with regard to pay, hours of work, and conditions under which they serve.

Mr. President, in England men are deferred and "frozen" to their jobs in industry. The British have a lord presidents committee, which is a part of the

war cabinet. Therefore, the determination as to the allocation of manpower is made by a subcommittee of the war cabinet itself, the final governmental executive authority on the subject. They determine how many men shall be selected for the armed service, how many men shall be selected for industry, and how many men shall be selected for agricultural and other activities. In some cases they do "freeze" workers in their places, but, Mr. President, it was testified before our committee that before factory labor, for example, is frozen, the factory must pass inspection. It must pay a reasonable wage. It must employ its workers reasonable hours. It must comply with minimum conditions of work. The Government in turn sees to it that the man "frozen" to his job has some security and some protection in the job to which he is attached.

What I am saying is that the effect of this amendment would be to tell the draft boards of the country, "Keep the farm boys where they are regardless of whether they ought to be there; regardless of whether their employer is maintaining decent working conditions and giving them a fair wage; regardless of whether they are working fair hours, and regardless of whether the men can serve better somewhere else than where they are now serving."

Thus to enact legislation which has these fundamental inadequacies in it is a dear price to pay for an immediate emergency. If there is an emergency, instead of approving section (k) and "freezing" those inequities, and what Mr. Philip Murray called the present chaos in the use of manpower, I would rather see the President issue a directive to the Director of the Selective Service System saying, "I will allow the appeal of every man in agriculture who appeals if you do not instruct the draft board to give him substantially this treatment."

I would rather see the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission issue a directive and let us see if Director General Hershey will not follow it, since he was appointed by the President to lay down for the present, at least, the manpower policy of the country. Has any evidence been shown to the Congress that General Hershey has refused to abide by a directive of Mr. Paul McNutt? Has anyone brought this matter to the attention of the President and said that an Executive order was mandatory? Such procedure would serve the immediacy of the problem, but it would not write on the statute books a discriminatory piece of legislation which convicts us of the same inadequacy in dealing with the subject under discussion as administrative agencies of the Government have been responsible for during the past 11 months the war has been in progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, when the bill now under consideration was before the Senate I favored the amendment which called for 1 year of training of our 18- and 19-year-old youths before being sent overseas for combat service.

After lengthy consideration the conferees have deleted that provision. While I deeply regret it, nevertheless I shall support the conference report, because ever since Pearl Harbor and our entrance into the war I have supported, and will continue to support, measures which those charged with the duty of carrying on the war say are essential to its successful prosecution.

The Nation is in the throes of a great conflict. It is a time when we each have one supreme duty, and that is to hold up the hands of our Commander in Chief, of General Marshall, and of those at the head of each branch of our armed forces in regard to vital measures which they tell us are essential to victory.

Inasmuch as these leaders have plainly told us that the inclusion of this provision would seriously handicap them in prosecuting the war, while regretting that the provision for 1 year of training is not in the bill in its final form, yet I feel it my duty to give our war leaders my support in this time of national peril, and shall vote for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, after debate and a very decisive majority vote the Senate adopted an amendment which provided that there should be a year's training for boys under 20 years of age, and that either they should have 12 months of training or should be 20 years of age before being sent into combat service. That amendment has been abandoned by the conferees.

I do not agree at all with the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] that we are bound to accept the opinion of the Army on a question of this kind. It seems obvious to me that if the Army says it must have seven and a half million men, it must have seven and a half million men, and I shall vote to give them seven and a half million men. However, it seems to me that whether they shall come from those who are 18, 19, 20, or 21 years of age, is a question on which we have a perfect right to pass judgment; and the Senate has passed judgment. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] what efforts were made by the Senate conferees to convince the House conferees that the amendment should be inserted in the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Of course, the House conferees were fully advised of the action of the Senate. The conferees met one afternoon for about 3 hours and the next morning for about 2 hours. The result was as I have already reported to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senate conferees attempt to reach any compromise with the House conferees? I believe it is clear that not only was there a large majority in favor of the amendment including boys up to 20 years of age, but that if we had voted in the Senate on the amendment including only those up to 19 years of age we should have had an even more overwhelming majority. Six or seven additional Senators would have voted to postpone any combat service until a boy was 19 years of age. In my opinion that age is more important than the age of 20, because it is the 18-year-old boys who

are in the questionable class on the question of draft. I wonder if any effort was made to compromise by proposing that both Houses accept the amendment as originally offered by the Senator from Nebraska by changing the provision so as to make it apply, instead of to those under 20 years of age, to those under 19.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, all those ideas and compromise plans were thoroughly discussed. The conferees on the part of the House were in no frame of mind to accept the Senate amendment, and I presume they feel vindicated by the overwhelming vote of acceptance which the House gave their judgment on the floor day before yesterday. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that every one of the Senate conferees went into the whole matter thoroughly, not for merely 5 minutes or 10 minutes or 1 hour or 2 hours, but for 5 or 6 hours where there were only 10 men around the table.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand, then, that the Senate conferees argued strenuously in favor of the Senate amendment with some modification of it?

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure the Senator from Ohio could so conclude and feel that he had reached a correct conclusion.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota whether, before agreeing to the House provision, the conferees were able to obtain from the Army any definite statements of principle on which they were going to try to give as much training as possible to boys under 20 years of age or treat them any differently from the older men?

Mr. GURNEY. We had a complete statement from the several Army men who came before us, at our request, that they would follow through the line of training as outlined originally by the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, and that the inductees would receive every bit of training that was necessary for them to have before they went into combat service.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator interpret that to mean that the great majority of them will have 12 months' training?

Mr. GURNEY. The very great majority of those who go into front-line combat will have 12 months' training, as they have had in the past. I might state to the Senator that they have not only had 12 months' training in the past but the great majority of them have had much more than that. When it comes to the Services of Supply, mechanics, truck drivers, and other allied branches essential to the Army, there is no necessity of men in those lines having 12 months' training.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment adopted by the Senate applied only to combat service; it did not apply to the Services of Supply and similar service?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator advise me as to the status of 18-year-old boys with respect to becoming officers? Was any assurance given that they would be accorded the same general treatment as is accorded older men? May they go to officers' training camps and become officers the same as the older men, so far as the law and regulations are concerned?



Mr. GURNEY. Definitely, the short answer to that is, yes. The experience of the past few years has been that the Army did not take into consideration age at all in giving aptitude tests, mental tests, physical tests to become eligible for officers' training; and, to my own personal knowledge, many 18- and 19-year-olds have become officers. Of course, I will admit that a greater percentage become officers after they are 21, as they have had more experience in life, and possibly a higher degree of college education. Such men have a better chance of becoming officers than those who have not had such experience and schooling.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I should like to add a further word. The other day, when I spoke on this bill, I made the statement that the 18-year-old boys did not have the opportunity of becoming officers, and that that was unfair to them. I was called up by the War Department and was told that there is no regulation of law which prevents such advancement for younger men. However, I think the principle of what I said is still true. A boy of 18 drafted into the Army has very little opportunity of advancement. He must be recommended for an officers' training camp over a great many older men in his regiment who have been there for some time. So I think the substance of what I said at that time was true, in spite of the protest of the War Department. Trained younger men will not have the opportunity for as effective service as if they were drafted when they were somewhat older or if they had had a few years' military training.

Mr. O'DANIEL and Mr. DANAHER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Texas, who rose first.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Ohio has called attention to the strong sentiment in favor of the 1-year training amendment as expressed by the vote in the Senate. I should like also to call attention to the fact that the RECORD shows that, in addition to the 39 Members who voted for the amendment, 14 other Members absent at that time were recorded as being favorable to the amendment, which shows a very strong sentiment in the Senate in favor of the amendment which was adopted by the Senate and which was rejected by the conferees.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. I might say that I think our conferees should have insisted on the amendment as modified to cover boys 19 years of age. I think the House would have accepted it, and I believe that it would have practically eliminated the inconvenience which the Army claims is involved in the amendment of wider scope. Such an amendment would have established in this country exactly the rule which the English have found to be proper after 3 years of warfare in protecting the 18-year-old boys whom they chose to draft. I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is one point the Senator from Ohio made

a few moments ago which it seems to me should be stressed with greater emphasis than has so far been made apparent; that is, that the amendment actually applies in its limitation only to putting 18- and 19-year-old boys into combat service. It is no answer simply to say that these boys might become truck drivers or they might become part of an air force ground crew, or might be in a mechanic service unit or something of that kind. It was to preclude their being put into combat service that the amendment was carried, was it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. It is a fine point, but I should like to call it to the attention of both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut. The amendment adopted by the Senate not only contained the words "actual combat duty," but was further qualified by the words "beyond the territorial boundaries of continental United States." Are we to have a judge follow the troops around, say, in England or Africa, and say that a certain man 10 miles behind the line is not in combat duty? He might not be in such duty today, but tomorrow an airplane might come over and he would be right in the front line and in combat duty.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield to me, of course, all our air-raid wardens and our auxiliary police walking up and down the streets of Washington come within that category. We might be bombed some night, and that is why we have black-out curtains all over the city. That, of course, is not an answer; it begs the whole question that was involved as a matter of principle when we were arguing the proposition on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut I am sure that to have an efficient Army we would not want to charge our Chief of Staff with the duty of taking along with him Members of Congress or others to tell him after he has his troops over there that certain individuals must remain 30 or 31 miles behind the line.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, it is a singular thing that, let me say while the Senator from South Dakota is here and in view of his observation, that the Army, which is said to have known these needs, did not sponsor this legislation. I recall distinctly on the floor of the Senate that the Senator from South Dakota said that this was his idea. I remember the Senator from Michigan queried him on the point when the matter was before us a month ago. Of course, if the Army had really wanted these boys, it has had no reticence up to now in bringing forward legislation it chooses to sponsor. This idea, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, was his own.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to correct the Senator's impression. It was my idea, and as to the legislation no one urged me. Certainly I had observed in many Army camps the need of it; and certainly the Army Chief of Staff would not overnight urge this legislation if he had not previously seen the need of it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio retain the floor because I wish to ask him a question, but while we are on this point, I do not know anything about the state of mind of the Chief of Staff of late, but I hold in my hand the hearings containing his testimony and I know that in 1941 he was here telling us that men ought to have a minimum of 18 months' training before they would be qualified. Then he told us he was willing to take 15 months and he settled for 12 months in order to get a bill on the subject. That was his testimony.

In this connection let me say to the Senator from Ohio that in a letter addressed by me to Hon. Henry L. Stimson, under date of October 26, I quoted an excerpt from a letter which I had received from the parents of a New Haven, Conn., boy. The excerpt reads as follows:

Parents of boys in Connecticut would like to know why boys here sent to Fort Devens are sent abroad in 6 weeks. It seems tragic and without any training. Thousands must be in the service longer.

Mr. Stimson's administrative assistant wrote me under date of November 3, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of October 26, 1942, addressed to the Secretary of War—

I omit a small portion—

Regarding the assignment of military personnel to overseas stations without sufficient training.

The duration of military training given to military personnel depends upon the experience and qualifications of the enlisted man and the duty to which he will be assigned. The time required to train some men to perform their military assignments might be much shorter because of their civilian training than it would be for others. All units and individuals leaving the continental United States are not destined for areas immediately—

I emphasize the word "immediately"; the writer of the letter does not do so, but I do—

Immediately threatened by severe combat, but many are sent to security garrisons offering special opportunities for further training.

The War Department recognizes the anxiety of parents for the welfare of their sons in the service and you may assure your constituent that every possible effort is being made to provide adequately for the training as well as for the health, comfort, and contentment of the military personnel wherever they may be stationed.

Sincerely yours,

I ask the Senator from Ohio if he had in mind in his earlier queries to the Senator from South Dakota the possibility that the conferees might easily have said

that "in our judgment, 18- and 19-year-old boys ought not to be sent into combat service until they shall have had a minimum of a given number of months' training," even though they omitted the provision of the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota has since stressed which would have prohibited their being sent beyond the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that some modification could have been secured by our conferees that would have carried out the substance of the idea in which, I think all of us here are interested. I am anxious to take at full value the protestations of the Army that they are going to train these boys.

They are permitted to train them, and if they fail to train them properly before they go abroad, if they send them abroad when they should not go abroad, I feel that the responsibility is today completely on the officials of the United States Army. I wanted to make that point in this series of questions.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might have an opportunity to register again in the Senate our desire to write into the law a provision for the guaranteed training of those who will be the youngest soldiers in the American forces.

We have gone a long way in the last few months, all the way from staying out of war until we are in all the wars of the world, on 40 fronts. Suddenly we need seven and a half million men, and in order to get them we must take 18- and 19-year-old boys. I am sure it seemed to all of us only fair that these boys when taken should be guaranteed adequate training.

I understand full well what it means to say we must not tie the hands of the military leaders, and surely none of us would want to tie their hands in any degree, but in a representative republic, in which the people have nothing to say to the Army except through their representatives, we might at least assure the hearts of the parents of America that their children will at least be trained adequately before they are sent to distant points of the world.

We shall vote in a moment, and when we vote we will say to the Army, "It is your responsibility." We have no other choice. According to the parliamentary rules, we must either vote for all the report or none of it. I shall vote for all of it, but I shall do so with the thought in my heart and mind that I have registered here the expression that it is the will of the people of America that these young men be trained before they are dispatched to the far corners of the earth to lay down their lives in this all-out war all over the world.

I want whatever I say now to be notice to the generals and the admirals, to the Commander in Chief, and to every one else, that this is a representative republic, so reemphasized recently, and much that we will do will be in the name of supporting the Commander in Chief, and that we will all do, of course. Much will be done under the guise of supporting the head of the armed forces, and that we will do, of course, but in doing

so we are doing it to save a representative republic.

We, in this Chamber, represent the people of America, and it is our responsibility to assure them that untrained youths shall not be sacrificed all over the globe. There is no doubt these young men will make the greatest soldiers in the world. I know something about it. I served with such young men, I know the courage and the daring of young men, but thank God in the unit in which I had the privilege of serving we were all trained, and I hope these boys will be trained. I am sure that must be the will of every Senator, and I hope those on the Committee on Military Affairs, and the conferees, who did or did not make such a gallant fight to sustain the amendment of the Senate, will say to the admirals and to the generals, when they come, "Certainly it was the will of the Senate that you train these men before you send them to face their death under various climatic and physical conditions, and in conflict with the steel of the old world," much of which we sent them. These boys have a right to be trained before they face that steel and those trained armies.

If I had any other way to proceed than by voting against drafting them, I would utilize it, but I have no other way, so I want my expression to hold, so far as I am privileged to represent the people of my State, that I think now we should all reemphasize privately wherever we can that it is our will that these young men be trained adequately so that they can defend adequately their young lives and the whole future of America.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senate is confronted at this time with a condition which is often met in every legislature consisting of two branches. We have before us a conference report, and we are required to consider it and act on it. We are confronted with the situation that, in order to get what we believe to be good, we must take what we believe to be bad, and in order to prevent what, in our judgment, is evil, we have to vote even for the evil in order to get something which we believe to be right.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained two vital amendments, both of which received large votes in the Senate. One provided for the training of 18- and 19-year-old soldiers before they were put into combat service, and the other provided for a very important proposition, that we retain on the farms of America a sufficient number of experienced men to produce the food necessary to sustain our Army in the field, as well as for other purposes. One of the amendments has been agreed to, the other has been rejected.

I feel more deeply about the rejection of the amendment relating to the training of 18- and 19-year-old soldiers when I listen to the reasons given by military men as to why the amendment should not be agreed to. We have been taught over a series of years that the very minimum of training necessary takes 1 year. We all believe that to be so. We have been so informed by our military leaders. After listening to thousands of letters, and the prayers which came from

the mothers of these boys, scattered all over the United States, we voted to bring about that result. These mothers knew, as we knew, that our military leaders had often said, "Our soldiers must have a minimum of one year's training." That seemed reasonable. Our recent experiences have taught us, in my opinion, that the period of training should be made longer. The soldiers now on the battlefields in all the various parts of the world are meeting conditions which have never before been met by soldiers anywhere. They have to combat the most unprincipled program which has ever confronted any civilized people. They should have at least the minimum training I have mentioned.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who propounded some questions to the Senator from South Dakota, and I think the indications are that the Senate conferees did not make the effort they should have made before they surrendered on the amendment, which had received a large vote in the Senate. It seems to me that instead of an absolute rejection it should come before us in the conference report in some form of a compromise. It seems to me that out of all the controversy there should have been something left in the bill in answer to our votes and to the prayers of millions of mothers scattered all over the country.

These mothers have a right, under the circumstances, at least to be suspicious of the rejection of the amendment, because the same men in the military service who are now objecting to it, so-called experts, had been telling us, and telling the country, and telling the mothers, that 1 year's training was the minimum necessary for anyone of any age.

Mr. President, the argument now made against that is, "We do not intend to send these boys into combat across the seas. We are going to give them training, but we do not want any strings attached to their induction; we do not want any restraints placed in our way."

The answer to that comes back—it ought to come back from the Senate, but it comes back from the mothers of America—"If that is the way you feel, if that is what you are going to do, why not put it in the law?" It is no answer, Mr. President, to say that it does not require a year's training to teach a man to drive an automobile. Such a statement is begging the question, and I would have more respect for the sincerity of these men if they had not made such an argument, which to me seems to be foolish.

If the Senate amendment were agreed to, it would apply to combat service across the seas only. It would not apply in case of invasion of our country. The boys could be used here for combat service in case of invasion of the United States. We must have some Army here. The amendment has no application to such a situation.

Mr. President, I myself cannot help but feel a suspicion, of which I should like to clear my mind. I do not want to find fault with the conferees. I know the difficulty of their situation; it may be they have done everything they possibly could; but it seems to me that the Senate amendment, which was adopted on a



yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, after full debate, without limitation of debate should not be thrown out the window entirely. If 1 year of training is too much, let us have 9 months, or 6 months. If Senators do not wish the provision to apply to 19-year-old boys, why not make it apply to 18-year-old boys? There are a thousand ways in which a compromise might have been agreed to. It seems to me the conferees on the part of the House would have conceded something along that line if they had been met with a stubborn unanimous resistance from the conferees on the part of the Senate. In that case it seems to me our conferees would not have been turned down empty handed.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, we are confronted with the proposition of having to vote against one amendment, in order to obtain another amendment which we believe to be right. In order to keep evil out we have to reject some good. There is no alternative.

We are face to face with that responsibility. If, for instance, some Senators should say, "We will reject this conference report," and vote against it on the ground that this one amendment has been entirely thrown out, and if the result of the vote were that the conference report was agreed to, which it probably would be—and I do not think anyone doubts it—then the Senators who voted against the report, and who must go before the people in the future with that action on their record, would be faced with the charge that they had voted against this farm amendment, and, technically, the critic would be correct, at least to a very great extent, in condemning such action.

On the other hand, if the report were rejected, of course, a different conclusion or presumption would arise, because we would immediately have another conference report come back to the Senate. Under the circumstances it seems to me we are justified, when we consider everything, in accepting the conference report, much as I dislike to do so. I know if we do not it will be charged that we are delaying action by military experts in carrying on the war, which none of us wants to do, God knows; and, probably with the certainty that the conference report will be agreed to anyway, we ought not to go any further than to express, if we care to do so, our convictions on the subject.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President. I heartily agree with most of what the Senator from Nebraska has just said. I cannot agree, however, with the idea of voting for the conference report by reason of the fact that it contains the exemption with respect to farm labor. I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska that the conferees on the part of the Senate did not put up the kind of fight they should have made in trying to obtain some compromise in the event they could not get all the Senate voted for. I do not think any showing has been made by anyone that 18- and 19-year-old boys are needed at this time. If a showing had been made that it was absolutely necessary to have them,

then I would be willing to vote for the report. I am not going to vote for the report when in one breath the Army officials say it is necessary to give a year or 18 months training to a selectee, and in the next breath want to send the 18- and 19-year-old boys into combat service without that sort of training if they see fit to do so. We know that men are being sent to foreign shores today with practically no training.

Mr. President, I have received letters from some of the leading doctors of the country, some of them in my own home State, saying there is no question that the nervous systems of boys 18 and 19 years old do not stand up as well as those of men over 20 years of age.

So far as I am concerned, regardless of whether or not a little sop is given to the farmers of the country in this bill, I am not going to have it on my conscience that we turned these 18- and 19-year-old boys over to the Army officials, and said, "You can take them and send them into combat service any place in the world."

England does not do that. Canada does not do it. I do not know of any of our Allies who are doing it.

Mr. President, the question has been asked on the floor of the Senate: Are we doing our part in this war? We are furnishing food, we are furnishing money. I am not criticizing England. I do not go so far as Mr. Willkie does in his criticism of her. He was one who shouted that we had to do everything we could to help England. Some there were who shouted we must help England because we were dependent upon the British Navy. How silly that must seem at the present time to anyone with common sense. Oh, yes; we must have the British Navy to protect the United States of America from destruction. Winston Churchill said:

Give us the tools and we will do the rest.

We gave them money, we gave them tools, we gave them ships, and then we gave them our Army and our Navy, and now they say, "Give us the kids, give us the boys. Take them out of the high schools. Take them out of the colleges; give us your teen-age boys. Give them to us, and let us send them to the four corners of the world."

Mr. President, that may be done by those who follow blindly anything asked of them by the administration. But the time will come when the people of the United States will say, "We do not want any dictatorship here and we do not want the Congress of the United States to abdicate." The people are already saying it. That was one of the reasons for the results of the last election. Make no mistake about that. The election did not result as it did because of the fact that only the well-to-do turned out to vote. What nonsense! It was not because the soldiers did not vote. It was because the people of this country were opposed to having the whole civil population of the country regimented by a lot of bureaucrats in Washington who do not know the problems of the people in the hinterland. The people voted as they did be-

cause they did not want any administration, Republican or Democratic, to have all these dictatorial powers.

Mr. President, the other day I picked up the Journal published by the Teamsters Union, Dan Tobin's organization. What was said in it? I quote from an article by Lester M. Hunt:

There will be men who say that we have become a dictatorship—that we have embraced the very philosophy we have gone to war to defeat. Well, how else can we win this war? The only way to defeat a hostile army is with a stronger army. Militaristic methods must be adopted to defeat militaristic powers. We must put our civil liberties in escrow.

We are going to be forced to live under a dictatorship for a time. But it will be a dictatorship to preserve the democratic system we have always enjoyed. It will be administered for the protection of those who submit to it rather than for the profit of those who direct it.

Mr. President, think of a labor leader saying that. Think of him saying that in order to win the war against dictatorship we must set up a dictatorship in this country. Think of a labor leader saying that we must do away with our civil rights. Thank God this man does not speak for the rank and file of labor.

I do not care if every labor leader in the United States of America says we must do away with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; I shall not be a party to such a movement. The people of this country are perfectly willing to make any sacrifice necessary to be made in order to win the war. I care not whether they are farmers or what they are, but they are not willing to turn over to the military authorities or to the administration dictatorial powers, unless it is shown to be absolutely necessary, and no such showing as that has been made or could be made. The only ones who are suggesting it and asking for it are some persons here in the departments who want to have control for their own selfish purposes.

Read this article in the Teamsters' Journal and then tell me if it is not almost the exact language used by Mr. Hitler to the people of Germany at the time he assumed dictatorial powers. I say shame on any labor man or labor leader who tries to tell the people of this country that we should do away with the freedom of speech, that we should do away with the right of trial by jury, that we should do away with the Bill of Rights simply because we are in a war. I say shame on any labor leader who says we have to set up a dictatorship in this country in order to preserve democracy.

If the Congress wishes to have the respect which it demands, it is time for it to exercise the power given to it under the Constitution, and not abdicate and turn over all its powers to the bureaucrats in Washington. So long as I am in the Senate I shall never vote to abandon the powers of Congress, and if the people of my State want somebody who will do so, they had better elect some one else to fill my place. I will not vote to turn over to the military authorities the right to take these children—for that is all many of them are—send them to the

four corners of the world, and put them into combat service, simply because of the fact that there is written into this bill a provision that the local boards may exempt farmers.

I believe that the committee representing the Senate at the conference, most of the Members of which were opposed in the first instance to such a course, did not stand up and fight as they should have fought to obtain a compromise or to carry out the wishes of the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, recently we have been impressed with the fact that in construing acts of Congress in the administration of our laws the courts and the bureaus of the Government go to the discussions of the legislation in the Congress by Members of Congress to ascertain the real purpose, intent, and implication of the law. That was brought out forcibly in our recent controversy about the right of our bureaucratic government to fix the ceiling prices of agricultural products. That being true, I wish to make a matter of record the construction of section 2 of the bill, which provides as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 5 (f) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Any person 18 or 19 years of age who, while pursuing a course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act during the last half of the academic year at such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed until the end of such academic year."

I wish to find out, if I can, from the members of the conference committee—preferably the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the author of the legislation—just what this provision means, how far-reaching it is, and how we want it interpreted by the Selective Service Board, so that the people of the country may know who is to be exempt from induction for the remainder of the academic year when boys are summoned to the service of their country.

We all know, in a general way, what a high school is. In a general way we know something about the curriculum of a high school and the grades embraced in it. I should interpret the language "or similar institutions of learning" to eliminate any consideration of boys who are in their last year at a college or university, and who are about to obtain their degrees. They could not enjoy the exemption provided for, because no one would contend that a college or university is a "similar institution of learning" to a high school.

In my State we have in force the consolidated school system, by which students in rural sections are brought to central points. Some of those schools teach up to the tenth grade, and some as high as the twelfth grade. In the towns, not only of my State, but of other States, the high schools include the grades from the tenth to the twelfth. The consolidated schools begin with the lower grades and go up to the tenth or twelfth grade. I am wondering whether a consolidated school which teaches

from the eighth to the twelfth grade, and includes the same course as that of a high school, would be construed to be a "similar institution of learning."

Furthermore, I wish to know the reason for the discrimination against boys who, because of lack of opportunity, lack of wealthy parents, or because of the death of the member of the family upon whom the family depended for a living, have been delayed in getting into high school. Are they to be denied the privilege of finishing an academic year of their education when they have entered primary schools and are trying to prepare themselves to enter high schools? Why the discrimination? I think a boy who is in the intermediate or primary school, working for a high-school education, is entitled to as much consideration in his effort to obtain an education for the battle of life as is the boy who happens to be fortunate enough to have completed his course and enrolled in a high school. I do not think it is quite fair to a boy who is in college and who, by finishing one semester, or 1 year, could obtain his degree from the college or university, to take him out of the university or college and rush him off to the Army when we allow high-school boys to finish 1 year—not necessarily the last year, but any one of the 4 years of the high-school course. I think there is a discrimination. We seem to be saying to the unfortunate boy who has not yet entered high school, "You Dumb Dora, we are going to take you out and put you in the Army, and yet we are going to let the high-school boy who has a 4-year course, be deferred until he finishes whatever year he may be in before he is called into the service of his country." I think that is discrimination. It is not fair, just, or righteous. It is so unrighteous that it is almost criminal.

I, for one, believe that this war will last from 5 to 10 years. The Japanese have said that they are prepared to fight for 20 years. It goes without saying that when boys of 18 and 19 years of age are inducted into service, their educational careers are over and they will go through life handicapped without the educational training to which they are justly entitled.

It will be remembered that during the debate on the bill I stated that I had no objection to the induction of boys into the Army provided they were kept in school until they were 20 years old and given basic military training while finishing their scholastic courses. I still believe that would be the fair, just, equitable, and patriotic thing to have provided for in this legislation. There is no reason why a boy should not receive his basic military training while pursuing his course in school. The boys in Annapolis and West Point receive academic training while they are taking their military training, as do the boys who have taken R. O. T. C. training in high schools and colleges. They are taking their academic training and at the same time receiving basic military training to fit them to be officers in the military forces after finishing school. There is no reason why teen-age boys should not be given an opportunity to continue their education up to the age of 20 and receive

academic training and military training at the same time. If such a program were pursued, the boys would be better equipped at the age of 20 not only to fight this war, but to discharge the duties of good citizenship when the war is over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am in hearty accord with much of what the Senator has said. If I correctly understood the Senator, he started to ask the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] what is meant by the words "or similar institution of learning." I wonder if he will allow the Senator at this point to state what a "similar institution of learning" means. Does it mean the smaller colleges, or what does it mean?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield. My purpose in taking the floor was to get some expression from the Senator on this subject.

Mr. GURNEY. I am always glad to answer questions whenever I can. The able Senators from Tennessee and Mississippi must know that by now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I desire to enlarge somewhat upon my question.

A number of persons from the smaller colleges of the country are wondering whether those words apply to such institutions. They apply particularly to high schools. There can be no question about that. I do not know whether they apply to smaller colleges. I believe the term is sufficiently broad to apply to smaller colleges, and I am wondering if that is what was intended by the inclusion of those words. Certainly they have some meaning.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The section to which reference has been made has to do with deferment for high school instruction. It applies to those attending schools in grades from the ninth through the twelfth, or similar institutions of learning which have a curriculum covering courses of training from the ninth through the twelfth grade in the public schools of America. The words "similar institution of learning" mean preparatory schools of all kinds, military schools, parochial schools, schools sponsored by other religious institutions, private schools, and academies. In general, I should say that they refer to completion of the high-school course. The words "high school or similar institution of learning" mean that the students are given the right to complete the school course in those institutions where students are prepared to go into colleges. I should say definitely that students in small colleges which offer regular college work above what is commonly known as the twelfth grade would not secure deferment under this section.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose a small college included grades from the ninth to the twelfth, besides additional work. Would the fact that it included three high-school grades be sufficient to make it a similar institution of learning?



Mr. GURNEY. My answer to that would be, certainly, if a college gives high-school work, a student in such an institution who had not theretofore completed his high-school work, would receive the same treatment as a high-school student attending a public high school.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to have that statement by the able Senator. I recall that not long ago the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown], who had charge of a bill, gave his interpretation of the bill. His interpretation was held to be of such strength as to be second only to an interpretation by the Supreme Court. I am very happy to have that broad—and I think entirely proper—interpretation by the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill. I entirely agree with it.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. Before yielding to the Senator from Kentucky, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a further question. Am I to understand that boys pursuing ninth- and tenth-grade work in a consolidated school, which teaches the ninth and tenth grades but does not go beyond those grades on up to the eleventh and twelfth grades—which would make a complete high-school curriculum—would be entitled to exemption as provided under the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. There is no question about it. They would come under the provisions of this section.

Mr. BILBO. That is very fine. I should like to ask a second question. In a junior college, where the first and second years are within the high-school bracket of the highest grades, yet there are taught two more grades which are the equivalent of the first and second years in the average college, would all students in such a junior college be entitled to the exemption provided by the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. If they were in classes which are comparable with the eleventh and twelfth grades in high school they would be accorded similar treatment.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. Some schools teach as far as the tenth grade and some as far as the twelfth grade. The Senator is basing his statement upon the fact that a high school, as recognized by the law, is a school that has the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BILBO. I want to say that I feel the Senator from South Dakota has been very gracious in trying to give us his views and has been very fair all the way through.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota to clear up another point. While colleges doing high-school work up to the twelfth grade would be permitted to have deferred students within those grades, the right of deferment would not apply to students in the same colleges beyond the twelfth grade who are supposed to be doing college work.

Mr. GURNEY. Of course, it would not apply, because they would be doing work that would be above that of high school.

Mr. BARKLEY. The fact that part of their student body would be entitled to the deferment would not carry over into the whole student body unless they were in the specified grades.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is correct and his interpretation agrees with mine entirely.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator another question before he takes his seat. Am I to understand that under the gracious deferment provided for in the conference report for high-school students or students in similar institutions of the Nation no student under the ninth grade in the other schools of the Nation, whether consolidated schools, public schools, or private schools, would be entitled to have deferment?

Mr. GURNEY. That is the correct interpretation, as I see it. It only defers those in high school. No consideration is given to students in grades below the ninth grade.

Mr. BILBO. If I may be pardoned a slang expression, the conference committee had a weakness only for high-school students.

Mr. GURNEY. I am quite sure that it is entirely to the contrary, because the evidence is preponderant that very few 18- and 19-year-old boys are still in school and still taking work of the eighth grade or below.

Mr. BILBO. I am glad the Senator made that point, because I am complaining at the discrimination against not tens of thousands but hundreds of thousands of students throughout the Nation who are in grades below the grades of high school and who are seeking to prepare themselves in order to enter the high schools. It is not only true of white people in this country, but in my State, where Negroes constitute half the population, there are 18- and 19- and 20-year-old Negroes who have not yet gone far enough in their educational preparation to enter the first, or ninth, grade of high school. It is not proposed to give them any consideration whatever, but to yank them into the Army, although the bill favors the boy who happens to be in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grade.

Mr. President, I have repeatedly voiced my opposition to this proposed legislation. I agree with some of my colleagues who insist that there has not as yet been made any showing that there is any pressing, imperative need for the teenage boys in the prosecution of this war. General McNarney of the Army before the Subcommittee on Military Affairs said plainly that there was adequate manpower within the military ages of 21 to 25 to build the Army up to 7,500,000 by December 1943. At that time I complained that the Army through their strict regulations as to the qualifications of the men they were inducting were eliminating those who had not passed beyond the fourth grade in the schools of our country. That would exclude the Alvin Yorks, of Tennessee, and Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, of military fame in the Civil War, neither one of whom had gone beyond the fourth grade, and

one of whom could not write his name, yet became a great military hero. The Army have eliminated that class from the draft because they wanted boys and men who had passed the fourth grade in academic educational training. The finest physical specimens living in the country will be found in those sections, in the hamlets, in the mines, in the farms and in the woods of the Nation who have spent their lives in the open, men who have not gone beyond the fourth grade, but who are strong, who are hard, who are determined, who are physically perfect, and would make the ideal soldier, because they could speak the English language and could understand an order when given to them in the Army.

They could convey a "message to Garcia," if necessary, because they know that much about the English language. They could shoot; they could fight. Yet, through some whim, the Army have eliminated this great mass of manpower in the present war because they have not passed beyond the fourth grade in the schools of our country. I think it is a perfect piece of nonsense.

On the other hand, the Army has consistently rejected the induction of tens of thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands, of strong, able-bodied men who are infected with venereal diseases such as syphilis. That has resulted in leaving in many sections of the country great numbers of able-bodied men who are able to take the training, be treated for the disease, be cured, and render service to the country. In other words, the Army's position has placed a premium upon the possession of the dread disease, syphilis, in the induction of men into the service, and it has gotten to such a point in my State that the young Negro who does not want to go into the Army, and has a natural inclination to stay away from battle, has gone out and sought contacts in order that he might contract the disease so as to be exempted from Army service. In many cases, when the selective service board makes a draft, the Army medical officers make the physical examination, not the local doctor. The examination is made at Army camps. Forty men may be sent to the Army from a county, 20 whites and 20 blacks, but practically all the Negroes are returned to the community and are exempted, while the white man goes on and fights the battle because he has not contracted this dread disease.

As I have said once before on this floor, the records in my State show, as attested by the State board of health, that out of a million Negroes there are 250,000 cases of venereal disease. That gives an idea of how prevalent this trouble is. It is a disease which can be treated and the men can be isolated in the camps of the country. The Government has ample money with which to build adequate facilities to isolate and treat them and train them at the same time. No one need tell me that men afflicted with this disease cannot be trained; they can be. I know one doctor in Mississippi in Oktibbeha County who every Monday morning gives "a shot" to 125 Negro men. They stay out of the sawmill 1 day and the other 6 days go to the sawmill and work at the hardest task in the world.

Such diseases have nothing to do with the training of men. Until the Army officials, the generals, absorb this great reservoir of manpower, made up of men who have not passed beyond the fourth grade in school, but who are over 20 years of age, who are physically fit, and who will make good fighters, ideal fighters, and until the Army absorbs the great class of men who are being exempted from the Army because of their own fault and their own acts and such an exemption should not be dignified by notice from the Army, I shall insist it is wrong to go to the teen-age boys of 18 and 19 and take them out of the schools and colleges of the Nation and put them into the Army, especially when the Army will not agree to give them at least a year's training, although they could be inducted and allowed to stay in school and be given military training at the same time, and there would be no loss in their preparation to help fight this war after they reach the age of 21.

I have tried to help perfect the bill, and get as many favorable things in it as I could, but I shall continue, so long as I represent, in part, the people of my State, to vote against such legislation as that now pending under such circumstances as I have stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, we have about reached the end of the debate. So far as this body is concerned, we have reached the time when we have to go upon record one way or the other.

Of course, I am familiar with what has been going on here. The Senate is familiar with it. My colleagues know how much chance we have in presenting this amendment to the Senate again; but I should be wanting in courage, I should be wanting in manhood, if I did not stand here and fight again for the amendment as we presented it a week or so ago.

We have all felt great interest in this matter; we have felt that it is most important to the fathers and the mothers of this land. We have now reached a stage in the fight when we have to say whether we shall put the mark of acquiescence upon an amendment which was presented to the Senate and adopted by a vote of 39 to 31, or whether we shall put upon it the mark of our negation.

Why should we back and fill concerning the amendment? What could be the reason, what is there about the amendment that should cause men who are sentient, and bold, and who have no fear of any kind or character to feel that they must hide and bother themselves and hunt a tree behind which to retire, or do some other thing of peculiar character? What is there about the amendment that causes that sort of thing? I am unable to see anything.

I see the amendment merely as a provision which was adopted by the Senate, for which our conferees were in honor bound to fight, and to bring back something which would be like that which we gave them. It was up to them to bring back to us something of that kind. But they did not do it; and why? Echo answers—why? I shall not pretend to say why. They did not do it, and now, in the last moments of this day, we are

presented a reason for making the motion again.

Various objections have been advanced by the Secretary of War. He is a very warlike man, mind you. He is a man who, if ever a question arose, would determine it according to his warlike proclivities. He would not fear at all. But he alone cannot determine this question. Do not forget that we have an equal right of determination. Some may not think so. Some may think that is a mistake, and that we should be of a kind that would not in any way do other than what the military might demand of us, that we should hold ourselves in readiness to take our medicine at all times. I am not ready to take mine. If others are ready to take theirs, well and good; I quarrel with no one, but I say if they are the sort of men I believe in, they will not tolerate backing and filling upon this amendment in the fashion that has characterized action thus far.

Many objections are made concerning this matter. I have here many letters about it. By the way, do you realize, Mr. President, that there are only two places on earth where there is opposition to this amendment, and they are—I dare say it—the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Great Britain. In the Congress of the United States we find bitter opposition to it, so bitter that a ye-a-and-nay vote would not be given to the man demanding it in the House of Representatives. There is bitter opposition to it, in the hope that its opponents will be able to bury us with an avalanche of votes in the Senate.

Let them bury us. What difference does it make? When a man has reached my age, one more vote does not make any difference; he will stand up to the rack and take his medicine, and vote as he pleases without regard to any of the things with which we are familiar in this debate.

The debate which has been proceeding here has been predicated upon certain objections to the drafting of 18-year-old men. I wish to read a very careful report.

I believe that our present military leaders are trying to do a good job.

We all admit that.

They are now being tried in the fire of war. That some of them will not stand the test is inevitable. I hope the incompetent may be discovered before their erroneous judgment leads us into courses of action which will cause us disaster. The safety of us all depends upon competent leadership. I support our leaders. I rely upon them. I accept their judgments generally. But I shall not take their judgments as infallible and I shall reject their conclusions when ordinary experience proves them wrong.

I have read with interest the newspaper statements to the effect that Army officers, testifying before the committees of the Congress, stated that these 18- and 19-year-old youths make the best soldiers.

I may say frankly that I do not believe that statement—

Nor do I believe it. The very essence of anatomy convinces one to the contrary.

The testifying Army officers seem to contend that these youths are the physical cream of the country and that they are better

fitted for war physically than older men. The field of sports offers a good test of a man's physical stamina. In major league baseball, which is a young man's sport, there are few teen-age youngsters used.

How well we all know that.

The best ballplayers are those in their twenties. In football, the college team is certainly superior to the teen-age high-school team. The best players on the college teams are the juniors and seniors, the very best often 23 and 24 years old, while the professional teams, made up of men above college age, are even better than the younger college teams. In crew, which is one of the most strenuous of all exercises, the frosh who are mainly 18- and 19-year-olds can't stand up against the varsity. In track, the college man is greatly superior to the high-school man, and in the greatest track meet of all—the Olympic games—many of the winners are older men, above college age. Virtually no teen-age youth places in the Olympic meets. Surveying then the field of sports which we know, it is apparent that teen-age youth is inferior physically to older men. That is not to be wondered at. The boys in their teens are not fully developed.

Can you not see that, Mr. President? Can you not realize it? When you meet a boy 16 or 17 years of age and take hold of his shoulders and caress him—we all love clean young men—can you not realize that those men are not equal to the older men in the world of sports, or in any other activity requiring strength and stamina?

As to judgment, I suppose no one, not even the testifying Army officers, would contend that teen-age youth has as much judgment as the older man.

It is a pity that we have to take this up ourselves, that we have to determine it ourselves. We have to determine the virility and the strength of the young men as against the older ones. That information should have been furnished us, it should have been given to the Committee on Military Affairs, it should have been stated here; but there has been no statement of it in this body during any of the time we have been considering this question.

I read further:

Today in combat judgment is necessary; the privates and noncommissioned officers act more independently than ever before. Upon their judgment often depends the success of a mission and the safety of themselves and the men about them.

Probably there is no difference in courage between the mature man and the teen-age youth. The teen-age youth may be and probably is more reckless—more rash. That in war can be a real handicap. Today it is essential that every particle of cover be used in order that one may survive and one rash move can endanger not only the life of the individual but also the lives of the men about him.

If 50 tanks manned by teen-age youths were put out to combat 50 tanks manned by men in their twenties and thirties, I think there would be no question as to the outcome of the combat. In judgment, skill, and in physical fitness the older man has the edge, and the statements of the testifying Army officers to the contrary belie our common experience.

From what experience with teen-age youths in combat did the Army officers draw their conclusions? Apparently it could not have been in Russia, for we are advised that our military men are not permitted to examine the Russian Army at close quarters, and the pictures we see of the fighting Russians



are pictures of men in their twenties and thirties, fully developed and hard. It could scarcely have been in Germany because we have been repeatedly told by our military experts that the German teen-age youths used on the Russian front were inferior soldiers. It could not have been in Britain, for the British Army is not fighting there. The British, although hard pressed for manpower, only drafted their 18-year-olds after the present bill went through the House, and then, apparently, not because they thought the draft of British 18-year-olds either necessary or desirable but only to keep step with the United States. What experience there has been on the African desert has involved a small number of troops. Even if teen-age youths have been used there in any considerable number (which I doubt), and even if they were used successfully, the whole African venture is on such small scale and under such peculiar conditions that any limited experience there cannot warrant any sweeping conclusion.

However, the bill to draft the 18- and 19-year-olds appears certain of passage. There is a movement now on to strike out the 1-year training period. As nearly as I can understand the position of the Army leaders on this, as stated in the papers, it is:

1. That many of these boys will be used in the service and supply forces and for that duty they do not require a year's training.

It seems to me I have heard that today, Mr. President.

If these teen-age youths are the best soldiers in the world, as these same Army officers have alleged, what monstrous folly to place them in the service and supply branches which certainly can be filled better with older men, men who are steadier and have had more mechanical and business experience. To put the cream of fighting men into service and supply is just nonsense.

Next, we are told that these boys, after 4 months' training, can be used as replacements for divisions depleted in action. It may be that 4 months' training is better than none, but certainly these boys with 4 months' training are not going to be well prepared to destroy the enemy or to protect themselves.

Mr. President, I suspend the reading of the letter at that point because of lack of time, and I do not want to bore the Senate.

Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur said, concerning this measure, that it was a national disgrace. Dr. Wilbur is president of Stanford University, a medical man, a great educator, and an eminent citizen. He designates the proposed legislation as a national disgrace.

Mr. President, I have received letters from persons all over the United States, some of which are like the one I read, which attack the whole scheme from beginning to end, without rancor and without nastiness. Without exception they all tell us the same thing, that we are going to have a terrible time if the bill is enacted into law. I have before me letters from all over the country, from all kinds of people, and if Senators wish to see them they may see them. These letters have come to me unsolicited. They are letters which strike at the very heart of this difficulty.

Mr. President, I say again, that there is only one place in this country where the amendment can be defeated and destroyed, and that is in the United States Congress. Senators may be as proud as Lucifer of the particular body to which

they belong. Mr. President, I venture the assertion that if we were to take a body of individuals of the same number and general character of those who compose this body, and if a vote were taken among its membership, it would be found that its members are overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment. I do not make this statement at random. That is shown by letters which have come to me from all sorts of people. The people of the Nation want this particular result; they want this particular amendment.

Mr. President, it is now 25 minutes to 5. I shall not detain the Senate longer than up to 21 minutes to 5. It will not do the Senate any harm to give me its attention for the remaining 4 minutes, so I shall continue.

I ask Members of the Senate to devote these 4 minutes to careful consideration of this particular question, and I believe there will be no confusion in their minds if in the action they are about to take they will vote just as they please and just as they desire. If my colleagues will think of the lads who would be the beneficiaries of the amendment which the Senate adopted it will not take them long to decide how to vote. If they will think of youth, and youth's prerogatives, youth's wish and desire to live, they will give our youth the benefit of the doubt at least and vote to retain the Senate amendment. If they will vote to protect our youth as youth should be protected, there will be no trouble at all.

Mr. President, if this matter is taken back to conference in the right spirit the Senate amendment can be made a part of the law. If it is not taken back in the right spirit, of course it will not be made a part of the law, and of course those who are so anxious that youth should wear a uniform, and proceed to engage in bloody combat, perhaps, will give youth the kind of uniform they desire. But if Senators will take this matter unto themselves, determine the question for themselves, and determine it as they think it ought to be determined, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I voted against the teen-age draft bill at the time of its original passage through the Senate. Since that time I have not seen any reason for changing the belief I entertained at that time against the drafting of these youngsters. I have been deeply impressed with a story, which I believe to be quite authentic, coming back with Americans who returned from Japan on the *Gripsholm*, which left Japan, I believe, on July 16 or 17 of this year. Allegedly Americans returned from Japan with the story that up to that time, even though Japan had been at war for something like 6 or 7 or 8 years, not one Japanese schoolboy had been taken out of school, high school, or college.

Mr. President, for the life of me I cannot understand why we should ask of our youngsters what other nations are as yet failing to require of theirs.

I shall vote to return the conference report to the conferees, in the hope that at least we can have the safeguard of requiring 1 year of military training for boys under 20.

I rose to address myself very briefly to another phase of the controversy which is pending. Each morning for many months my desk has been burdened with letters from my farming constituents which reveal the utterly impossible position in which the individual farmer is being placed and left. More recently the letters are revealing the number of farmers who are disposing of their stock and of their farm interests, and moving into town for want of farm help. In connection with the pending measure we sought to stay that tide of farm help away from the farms. We wrote in the so-called Tydings amendment. I am delighted that our conferees have maintained the Senate's position with regard to that amendment.

But I am led to wonder in connection with it about the manner in which that particular phase of the law is going to be administered. The law will provide, if we finally adopt the report:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces.

Mr. President, I do not suppose that anyone in this emergency is performing a more thankless task than members of local draft boards. My sympathies are with them all the way, and I rather resent the instances wherein draft boards have been reflected upon because of their failure to defer farm boys who were considered essential to the continuation of farm production. The local draft boards quite properly resent the insinuations which have been cast upon them. The local boards have been quite helpful, and in turn they are justified in turning to us in Washington and saying, "Do not blame us for what we are not doing. Get busy and write the kind of law that will prevent the continuing drafting of farm boys." They insist that the call upon them as members of the local boards is to furnish a certain number of men. I could recite endless communities in my State, as other Senators could in their States, where local boards have no one to draw upon at all if they do not draw upon the farm population.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have received a great number of letters from persons in my State in reference to this matter. What the Senator is speaking of may, perhaps, be the most important matter contained in the bill. It occurs to me from reading the language and studying it carefully that this will be a rule of conduct which will aid tremendously agriculture in our country. Does not the Senator from North Dakota agree that the rule which is here established in subsection (k) of section 4, will be effective for the purpose of deferring agricultural labor?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee speaks my mind very accurately on that score, and I am glad to see it there in the law, where it will

be of much aid to the local draft boards which have been exceedingly embarrassed for want of this kind of law. With it, I do not see that we need longer be gravely concerned about what the construction of the draft boards is to be as to what is necessary farm help. The law tells them pretty definitely what they must do with essential farm hands.

Mr. McKELLAR. I entirely agree with the Senator; and I agree with the statement which he has made as to the fairness and efficacy of our draft boards throughout the country. In my State they are composed of the very best men available, and they have given a great deal of satisfaction. As the Senator knows, it is very difficult satisfactorily to fill the position of a member of a local draft board. I believe that the passage of subsection (k) of section 4 would go a very long way toward settling our agricultural problems.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator for the expression of thoughts which I so largely share.

I now come back to the problem which is presented to my mind, as to the manner in which the law would operate. Under the Selective Service Act the States are required to supply a certain number of men when the Military Establishment calls for men. Assume, now, an extreme case of a State which has no men in it except those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits. Certainly there are many communities which are as strictly confined. I know of local boards which no longer have on their lists men other than farm hands. I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Dakota what the attitude of the Selective Service authorities is to be when the local boards and the State boards are unable to supply the number of men whom they are under call to supply? With this provision in the law, which virtually exempts the farm hands, what is to happen to the so-called quota system?

Mr. GURNEY. The information on that subject from the Selective Service headquarters in Washington is more in the nature of an explanation of how they have handled the quota requirements in the past year, or since the original Selective Service Act became law. They have spread the quotas in accordance with the number of classified I-A men available in each State. During periods of need for agricultural workers the quotas are adjusted. As an example, the quota was set for the State of Washington, and it was found impossible to meet it because of conditions in that State. The quota was lowered, with the idea of making good the shortage a little later.

Mr. NYE. In that particular instance, respecting the State of Washington, who made the representation to the Selective Service Board which brought about the release or excuse from filling the quota?

Mr. GURNEY. I presume, the chairmen of the local boards.

Mr. NYE. Or the State board?

Mr. GURNEY. Through the State board, and then on into Washington.

Mr. NYE. Then there is nothing in the law which prevents the selective-service authorities from transferring quotas, so to speak, from one State to another, or

excusing a State from filling the entire quota originally asked for.

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot quite accept that statement. I will say that there is nothing in the law which prevents the Administrator of Selective Service from saying to a State, "You will be short this month, but next month, or during the next 3 or 4 months, you can make good the shortage."

Mr. NYE. Is that what was done in the State of Washington?

Mr. GURNEY. As I remember, that was what was done in that particular case. The State of Washington was permitted to harvest its perishable fruit crops and to pick up the quota in succeeding months.

Mr. NYE. Whatever might be the excuse this month, next month would find the State still under obligation to fulfill its obligation under the quota system.

Mr. GURNEY. In accordance with the direct relation to the number of I-A men available in each State.

Mr. NYE. Then it follows that with paragraph (k) of section 4 of the pending legislation in effect, the excusing of farm hands who are deemed essential to farm production would still leave each and every State, however largely agricultural it might be, under the requirement of furnishing its full quota.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; but I must say to the Senator that it would not change the existing situation, because the National Selective Service headquarters has already told the local boards that they should defer necessary farmers in essential agricultural industries. That order has been in effect for many weeks.

Mr. NYE. But they have not at the same time told the States that they would be excused from filling in full the quotas asked for under the various calls which are issued for men.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. NYE. Does it not follow, if that rule is to be pursued, that in some States where the population is so largely agricultural, men will be called who would not be called if they were in other States?

Mr. GURNEY. Men in some other occupations.

Mr. NYE. Men in other occupations; men with larger dependency; and men with greater obligations.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. Men in a State which is not essentially agricultural are being deferred because they work in airplane plants. All airplane workers are being deferred because they are in an essential industry. Therefore a greater load undoubtedly falls on farmers who are engaged in raising lettuce, artichokes, or products of that kind.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator find that the authorities are giving any consideration at all to the possible necessity of altering the quota system?

Mr. GURNEY. Quotas are placed on each State by national headquarters in accordance with the number of men available for immediate military duty.

Mr. NYE. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. When the Army's order comes in for men, the State must go to the bin to fill the order. It must obtain the men from those who are al-

ready processed and available. An effort is made from month to month to even up the quotas so that the number of men coming from each State into the Army is not greater in direct ratio to population than in some other State. In the long run that course has been found to be very successful.

Mr. NYE. Very well. Take a State which is as strictly agricultural as are some of our States. It will have great difficulty in filling its quotas if farm hands are to be deferred in keeping with paragraph (k) of section 4.

Mr. GURNEY. Undoubtedly the local boards will comb closer those who are in other occupations in such States as the Senator's State and my State.

Mr. NYE. Let me suggest to the Senator that in some such States there are already local boards with no one except farm hands left on their rolls of registrants.

Mr. GURNEY. Then they cannot furnish any.

Mr. NYE. In that event what would happen?

Mr. GURNEY. The quota would be spread over the entire State. If the situation should become such that the State could not furnish the men, national headquarters would spread the quota elsewhere.

Mr. NYE. The Senator has finally answered my question.

Mr. GURNEY. I thought I had answered it before.

Mr. NYE. The Senator's final assertion is the complete answer. I appreciate the Senator's patience.

Mr. GURNEY. Heretofore, because of deferment of men engaged in essential airplane industries or in steel mills, quotas have been reduced, and the load has been taken on by other States which did not have such industrial deferments.

Mr. NYE. I understand. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement for the information of the Senate.

It had been my purpose today, following the consideration and disposition of the conference report, to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1716, House bill 1024, to amend an Act to prevent pernicious political activities, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. However, the debate on the conference report has extended much longer than I had anticipated, and therefore I shall not make that motion today. I wish to state, however, that I shall make it tomorrow.

It is my understanding that a point of order will be made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] against the report of the committee. The point of order will be presented to the Chair for his decision. I feel that Senators ought to know that the point of order will be raised tomorrow. As I understand, from



a parliamentary standpoint the point of order cannot properly be made until a motion is made to take up the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, the Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, in order that the point may be made, the motion will be made to proceed to consider the bill. Before the motion to consider the bill is voted upon the point of order must be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has correctly stated the parliamentary situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I can control it, that will be the procedure tomorrow.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] wishes to have the Senate act upon a couple of bills which will not be controversial.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the present occupant of the chair to say that a point of order to the motion by the distinguished leader would not lie until the motion is disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator misunderstood.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said that a point of order against the report of the committee would not lie until a motion was made to take up the bill for consideration.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate that; but when the able Senator from Kentucky makes his motion tomorrow and I make a point of order against the report of the committee, as I understand, the point of order must be disposed of before we vote on the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I so stated that a moment ago.

Mr. DOXEY. I wanted to have the parliamentary situation clear so that no Senator will be confused.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point of order will be debatable as long as the Chair desires to hear debate. Whenever the Chair is satisfied as to his decision, he has control of any further debate on the point of order itself.

Mr. DOXEY. I wish to state to my distinguished leader that I have not conferred with the Chair and do not know what his attitude will be, but I intend to make a point of order against the report of the committee when the motion is made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I so understood the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the present occupant of the chair is quite clear.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] desires to take up for consideration a couple of bills which are not controversial.

#### LOANS TO PERSONS DESIRING TO ENGAGE IN THE PRODUCTION OF MINERALS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1703, Senate bill 2746.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2746) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 14 (authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for mineral development purposes) of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is hereby amended by inserting in the second sentence of such section, after the words "engaged in," the words "or desiring to engage in."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill. However, I wish the Senator would make a brief statement concerning its purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. The only change the bill makes in the present law is to add in the second sentence of section 14, after the words "engaged in," the words "or desiring to engage in." In other words, it would enable the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans where such enterprises are not now actually in operation.

Mr. President, I offer a clarifying amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 14 of the act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and adding the following: "Provided further, That nothing contained in this section, as amended and supplemented, shall be construed to limit or modify the authority to make mining or other loans vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by subparagraph 2 of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, or by any other act of Congress or Executive order."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LOANS BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1704, Senate bill 2783, relating to loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2783) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial

purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes, as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That so much of section 14 of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), as reads as follows: "when, in the opinion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is sufficient reason to believe that, through the use of such loan in the development of a lode, ledge, or vein, or mineral deposit, or placer gravel deposit, there will be developed a sufficient quantity of ore, or placer deposits of a sufficient value to pay a profit upon mining operations," shall be suspended during the period commencing upon the date of enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the termination of the present war or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

#### ORGANIZATION AND REGULATION OF COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1701, Senate bill 2046, relating to the organization and regulation of cooperative associations in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2046) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia to provide for the organization and regulation of cooperative associations, and for other purposes," which was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That sections 41 and 44 of the act entitled "An Act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia to provide for the organization and regulation of cooperative associations, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1940, be, and the same hereby are, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 41. Foreign corporations and associations: A foreign corporation or association operating on a cooperative basis and complying with the applicable laws of the State wherein it is organized shall be entitled to do business in the District of Columbia as a foreign cooperative corporation or association: *Provided*, That the same is licensed as required by section 44 hereof."

"Sec. 44. Taxation: Associations formed hereunder, and foreign corporations and associations admitted under section 41 to do business in the District of Columbia and entitled to the benefits of section 37, shall obtain from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent an annual license, the fee for which shall be \$10. The first annual license shall be obtained prior to the issuance of the certificate of incorporation by the Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia. All licenses shall expire on the 31st day of October following issuance. The Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia, is empowered to suspend or revoke the certificate issued to any association or corporation which fails to obtain the annual license hereby required. Prosecutions for violation of this section shall be on information in the police court of the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel of the District of

Columbia or any of his assistants. Any association or corporation violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$300."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this bill provides a penalty for the doing of business in the District of Columbia by cooperative associations unless they are licensed. They have been required to pay fees in the past, but no penalty has been provided for cases in which they did not do so. The pending bill applies a penalty in that situation. There is a clarifying amendment which I desire to present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following: "That sections 41 and 44 of the District of Columbia Cooperative Association Act, approved June 19, 1940, are amended to read as follows:"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, for the Record I wish to say that the purpose of the clarifying amendment is merely to correct the date and reference to the title mentioned in the amendment. The title to the pending bill should also be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Cooperative Association Act, approved June 19, 1940."

#### CONDEMNATION OF INSANITARY BUILDINGS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1702, Senate bill 2734, relating to the creation of a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2734) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this bill has to do with the board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia. There has been an extremely cumbersome system in the District under which, when procedure was taken to condemn a building, a hearing would be held before a committee of officials of the District, and if objection was taken to their finding, another committee could be appointed by the court and the entire procedure reviewed, not by the court, but by a second committee. It has been found that in these days, when there is necessity for condemning a number of insanitary buildings in the District, that practice has resulted in a considerable handicap to the orderly

procedure in improving conditions in the city. Therefore it is requested by the District authorities that the law be amended as indicated in the bill. There is also a clarifying amendment to be offered to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That said board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings be, and it is hereby, authorized to investigate, through personal inquiry and inspection by the members thereof, and through inquiry and inspection by officers, agents, and employees, appointed or detailed for that purpose, into the sanitary condition of any building or part of a building in said District, except such as are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. If any building or part of building be found, as a result of such investigation, to be in such insanitary condition as to endanger the health or the lives of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity, said board shall cause a notice to be served on each owner or part owner of such building requiring him to show cause, within a time to be fixed by the board, why such building or part of building should not be condemned. The time to be fixed by the board shall not be less than 10 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after the date of service of said notice, unless the board shall find that the condition of said premises is such as to cause immediate danger to the health or lives of the occupants thereof or of persons living in the vicinity, in which event the board may fix a lesser time. If the owner or part owner of such building, within the time to show cause fixed by said board, shall in writing request a hearing before said board, said board shall fix a time and place for such hearing and shall notify the person requesting the same. If, within the time to show cause fixed by the board, or at such hearing, if the same be requested, the owner or part owners shall fail to show cause sufficient in the opinion of a majority of said board to prevent the condemnation of such building or part of building, said board shall issue an order condemning such building or part of building, and shall cause a copy of such order to be served on each owner or part owner thereof, and a copy to be affixed to the building or part of building condemned."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That from and after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after a copy of any order of condemnation has been affixed to any condemned building or part of building no person shall occupy such building or part of building."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That no person having authority to prevent shall permit any building or part of building condemned to be occupied, except as specially authorized by the board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia under authority of section 6 of this act, after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, from and after the date of service of a copy of the order of condemnation on the owner of such building; or, if there be several part owners of such building, from the latest date of service on any part owner; or, if a copy of such order of condemnation has been affixed to the

condemned building or part of building at a date subsequent to the date of service of the notice on any owner or the latest date of service on any part owner, after 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, from the date on which said copy of such order of condemnation was so affixed."

SEC. 4. Section 7 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking therefrom the words "where the repairs and/or alterations necessary to remedy the conditions which led to the condemnation thereof cannot be made at a cost not greater than 50 percent of the present reproduction cost of said building as may be agreed upon by a majority of said board," and also the words "carelessness or willful recklessness in."

SEC. 5. Section 8 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That whenever said board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings is in doubt as to the ownership of any building or part of a building, the condemnation of which is contemplated, because the title thereto is in litigation, said board may notify all parties to the suit and may report the circumstances to the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia, who may bring such circumstances to the attention of the court in which such litigation is pending for the purpose of securing such order or decree as will enable said board to continue such proceedings looking toward condemnation, and such court is hereby authorized to make such decrees and orders in such pending suit as may be necessary for that purpose."

SEC. 6. Section 14 of said act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to prescribe reasonable penalties of fine not to exceed \$300 or imprisonments not to exceed 10 days, in lieu of or in addition to any fine, for the violation of any building regulation promulgated under authority of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District to make and enforce regulations relative to the sale of coal, and also building regulations," approved June 14, 1878, and any regulation promulgated under authority of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make police regulations for the government of said District," approved January 26, 1887, and any regulation promulgated under authority of section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to regulate licenses to proprietors of theaters in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 26, 1892.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio proposes an amendment, which will be stated:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out section 4, lines 7 to 14, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 4. Section 7 of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The owner or owners of any building or buildings condemned under the provisions of this act, which cannot be so changed or repaired as to remedy the condition which led to the condemnation thereof, shall demolish and remove such building or part of building within the time to be specified by said board in the order of condemnation. And if any owner or part owner shall fail or refuse to demolish and remove said building or part of building within the time so specified he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to the penalties provided by section 13 of this act, and such building or part of building shall be demolished and removed under the direction of the board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and



the cost of such demolition and removal, including the cost of making good damage to adjoining premises (except such as may have resulted from carelessness or willful recklessness in the demolition or removal of such building), and the cost of publication, if any, herein provided for, less the amount, if any, received from the sale of the old material, shall be assessed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as a tax against the premises on which such building or part of building was situated, such tax to be collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask the privilege to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee on the bill, which contains a letter from the acting president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia explaining the measure in detail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report (No. 1648) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2734) relating to the creation of a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia addressed to the chairman is attached hereto and made a part of this report for the information of the Senate. This letter explains in detail the purposes for which this legislation is sought.

GOVERNMENT OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
Washington, August 7, 1942.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the  
District of Columbia,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The Commissioners have the honor to forward herewith a draft of a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the act relating to the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia. The procedure provided by the existing statute is so unnecessarily cumbersome as to prevent speedy action to require the remedying of insanitary conditions, if the owner of the building is not willing to cooperate. At this time, when housing facilities are limited, and tenants and roomers are not free to leave, because of insanitary conditions, their present abodes and select new ones, it is imperative the municipal authorities be clothed with power sufficient to require property owners to keep their buildings in habitable condition.

The most important change made by this bill in the existing act is the repeal of section 14 thereof (sec. 5-614, D. C. Code, 1940). That section gives to a property owner, whose building has been condemned by the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, the right to institute an action in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia for the appointment of a new board of survey. Proceedings are had de novo before such Board. It is believed these proceedings in court are unnecessary if

due process of law is afforded a property owner by giving him an opportunity to appear before and be heard by the administrative board. Section 3 of the existing act (sec. 5-603, D. C. Code 1940) is amended by section 1 of this bill so as to provide for such hearing upon request. Of course, this bill does not deprive a property owner of his right to resort to the courts if the Board should be guilty of arbitrary action. Section 3 of the act is also amended by reducing the time in which the owner must show cause from 20 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, to 10 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill amend sections 4 and 5 of the act (secs. 5-604 and 5-605, D. C. Code 1940) so as to reduce from 30 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, to 15 days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, the period during which a building may be occupied after service of notice of condemnation.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 7 of the act (sec. 5-607, D. C. Code 1940) by striking therefrom the provision that an insanitary building cannot be repaired but must be demolished if the cost of the repairs exceeds 50 percent of the reproduction value of the building. We believe it unreasonable to require an owner to demolish his building unless reasonably necessary for the protection of life, health, or safety. If an insanitary building can be put in a sanitary condition it is immaterial, so far as life, health, and safety are concerned, what relation the cost of the repairs bears to the reproduction value of the building. With this amendment the statute would only require an owner to demolish his building where it cannot be put in a sanitary condition.

Section 7 of the existing act requires a property owner to make good damages to adjoining premises caused by carelessness and willful recklessness on the part of the District in demolishing a building. We do not believe it just to charge a property owner with such damages. This bill, therefore, further amends section 7 by striking therefrom the words "carelessness or willful recklessness in."

Section 5 of the bill amends section 8 of the act (sec. 5-608, D. C. Code 1940). This section of the act provides that where the title to property sought to be condemned is in litigation certain proceedings must be instituted in that litigation. This bill amends section 8 so as to make the institution of such proceedings optional with the Board of Condemnation.

Section 6 of the bill repeals section 14 of the existing act for the reasons hereinbefore stated.

Under existing law the Commissioners are only authorized to prescribe penalties by way of fine for the violation of building and police regulations. It has been found that such penalties are inadequate since in many cases persons find it cheaper to pay the fine than to comply with the regulations. Section 7 of the bill gives the Commissioners the power to prescribe penalties of fine not to exceed \$300 or imprisonment not to exceed 10 days in lieu of or in addition to any fine for the violation or building and police regulations.

The bill and reports thereon have been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Director of the Budget advises that there is no objection on the part of that office to the position taken by the Commissioners in connection with this matter.

Respectfully,

C. W. KURTZ,  
Acting President, Board of  
Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### WOMEN'S COAST GUARD AUXILIARY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1709, House bill 7629, to provide a Women's Auxiliary Corps for the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7629) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the Committee on Commerce.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 3, after the word "aircraft", to insert "and shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after the word "act", to strike out the colon and the words "Provided, That notwithstanding the foregoing the provisions of subsection 211 of this act shall be applicable to members of the Women's Reserve who are assigned to duty outside the States of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state, for the information of the Senate, that the bill provides an auxiliary corps of women for the Coast Guard. It has been passed by the House; it has the favorable recommendation of the Navy Department; it was considered and favorably reported by the Committee on Commerce, the report being presented by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and I ask for its passage as chairman of the subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### ORGANIZATION OF CONSUMERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from a gentleman at Chapel Hill, N. C., the seat of our State university, together with an article in regard to consumers' organizations. In the letter he enclosed certain resolutions which he respectfully

requests that I ask permission of the Senate to incorporate.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chapel Hill Weekly of October 23, 1942]

CONSUMERS ORGANIZED—F. F. BRADSHAW IS ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF NEWLY ORGANIZED ASSOCIATION

At its charter meeting last Friday evening at the elementary school the Chapel Hill Consumers Association adopted a constitution and bylaws, elected officers and directors, adopted resolutions on taxes, food, and defense activities, and moved to cooperate fully with the local office of civilian defense.

Officers elected were F. F. Bradshaw, chairman; Mrs. Guy T. Johnson, vice chairman; Mrs. Nathan Rosen, secretary; and J. W. Humphries, treasurer. The directors are James Andrews, Mrs. Fred Barela, J. M. Lear, and Earl H. Newcomer.

R. Glover Miller, field representative of the Southeastern Chain Store Council, talked about the place of chain stores in the Nation's wartime economy. He endorsed the establishment of consumer organizations and asked the association to send his organization any complaints or suggestions made by local consumers about the retail grocery business here.

Other speakers were Bert Bennett, president of the university student body, and Mrs. Fred Barela, president of the Carolina Dames Club, which is composed of the wives of students. Mrs. Barela read a paper by Mrs. Agatha Adams of the university's war information center in which Mrs. Adams described the consumers' information literature available at the center.

At a meeting of the new board of directors last Monday evening Mr. Breckenridge was appointed counsel of the association and Mr. Lebrun was appointed executive secretary.

CHAPEL HILL, N. C., October 28, 1942.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: Thank you very much indeed for your kind note of the 21st.

We would like to have those resolutions made a matter of public record. Future historians, delving through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may be interested to find that additional bit of evidence that the people—in the midst of a war that all recognized was "all out"—were out in front of their leaders. Whether you approve of all of the items there or not, would you be so good as to have these resolutions inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD somewhere under your leave to print or to extend remarks. When you do, I would appreciate your sending me a note of the date and page number where it appears and, if possible, a copy of the issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that carries the item.

Again thanking you.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY LEBRUN,

Acting Executive Secretary, Consumers Association of Chapel Hill and Orange County, N. C.

Whereas our country is engaged in a war which requires the united support and action of all the people; and

Whereas full success in the war effort of the people has been, and still may be, threatened by rising prices and lowering quality of consumer goods, and by unequal distribution of the burdens of the war and of the war's financing; and

Whereas our President has laid down a program for stopping the further spiral of inflation and for safeguarding the Nation's economy; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Consumers Association of Chapel Hill and Orange County, in meeting assembled, That:

(1) We heartily endorse the President's program and call upon all citizens and agencies to do all in their power to help make it effective.

(2) In line with that program, we desire that this association shall be affiliated with and shall cooperate to the fullest extent with the local, State, and National councils of defense.

(3) In line with that program, we advocate immediate enforcement of price ceilings on all goods and services, including wages, rents, farm products, profits, and net incomes.

(4) To prevent injustices in the distribution of available goods and services, no matter how priced, we advocate the immediate rationing of all the necessities of life which are either already scarce or in danger of becoming scarce before the war is over.

(5) Since a ceiling on prices is meaningless and futile without a floor to quality, we call upon Leon Henderson and the Office of Price Administration to set up and enforce quality standards for consumer goods and services, and to promote the standardization, grading, and proper labeling of the content and quality of such goods and services.

(6) In the interest of promoting true political and economic democracy, both during and after the war, we advocate greater participation by the people in the actual processes of government and business. The Office of Price Administration should do more than merely ask consumers to boycott violators of price and rationing regulations. It should promote the organization of consumers and bring consumers into its enforcement machinery, making that enforcement machinery more effective by creating a Nation-wide system of volunteer price checkers and quality wardens to cooperate with the Office of Price Administration.

(7) We are in sympathy with Henry C. Morgenthau and the Treasury Department's opposition to a general Federal sales tax. If taxes are needed to control inflation, we advocate a tax on expenditures, above the minimum essentials of existence, in proportion to the luxuriousness of the expenditures. We are opposed to all taxes which burden most heavily those who are least able to pay taxes or which increase the cost of living for consumers in proportion to their needs rather than in proportion to their ability to pay.

(8) To finance the war to the utmost practicable extent through current revenues, and to drain off surplus funds of individuals who might use them, directly or indirectly, to promote inflation, we favor drastic increases in the taxes on income, wages, salaries, wealth, profits, bequests, and inheritances. To the same end, we advocate compulsory savings, graduated in proportion to ability to save—that is, without sacrificing the minimum requirements of health, decency, and efficiency in the war effort.

(9) If our Nation is to be spared and our way of life is to continue, we must devote all our resources in men, women, children, money, goods, and materials to the prosecution of the people's war. This entails sacrifices which the people are ready to make now without waiting for the fall of elections to be over, and to a much larger extent than seems to be believed by certain leaders of our Government.

(10) To make sure, however, that these wartime sacrifices are universal and equal, and are utilized to the fullest advantage of the war effort, of wartime agriculture, and of essential production for the war, as well as to help prevent inflation, profiteering, racketeering, and sabotage, we join with the American Legion in demanding the conscription of all the human and physical resources of the Na-

tion, including capital, labor, industry, management, agriculture, business, and the professions, as well as the fighting manpower of the country: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Leon Henderson, to Henry Morgenthau, Jr., to our Representatives in Congress, and to the President of the United States.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Harold A. Berliner, of San Francisco, California, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of California, in place of Clifford C. Anglim, resigned;

Several senior surgeons to be medical directors in the Public Health Service;

Dental Surgeon Henry T. Dean to be a senior dental surgeon in the Public Health Service;

Several assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Public Health Service;

Several engineers to be passed assistant sanitary engineers in the Public Health Service; and

Several engineers to be assistant sanitary engineers in the Public Health Service.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter Thurston, of Arizona, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and lately Minister Counselor at the American Embassy in Moscow, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Maj. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Medical Director Ross T. McIntire to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years;

Medical Director Charles S. Stephenson to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as Director of the United States of America Typhus Commission, to rank from the 4th day of November 1942; and

Capt. Walter S. DeLany to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Sundry postmasters.

#### POSTMASTER AT RALEIGH, N. C.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, today the Committee on Post Offices and



Post Roads reported the nomination of Dennis S. Inscow to be postmaster at Raleigh, N. C. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and he has requested that I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and confirmation of Mr. Inscow's nomination.

Mr. McNARY. Did the Senator state the nomination had been reported from the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it has been reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dennis S. Inscow to be postmaster at Raleigh, N. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

The chief clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 12, 1942:

##### COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

John J. Curley, of Boston, Mass., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Samuel T. Ladd,

whose term of office expired on March 31, 1942.

##### WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATOR

James M. Bryant, of Mississippi, to be Work Projects administrator for Mississippi, effective as of November 9, 1942, vice Q. Edward Gatlin, deceased.

##### TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 127a, National Defense Act, as amended.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 12, 1942:

##### IN THE NAVY

##### TEMPORARY SERVICE

##### To be rear admirals

Charles H. McMorris  
Calvin H. Cobb

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

##### To be assistant dental surgeons

John L. Biedermann	James R. Robinson
Frank J. Kalas	Edward A. H. Gargiulo
Joseph H. Scanlon	Clinton O. Olsen
Frank J. Smith	Richard A. Soja
John F. Bowman	David P. Dobson
Leo E. Brenning	Leonard E. Curphey
Howard W. Pierce	Damon E. Bernard
George E. Madden	Frank M. Wentz
George T. Moore, Jr.	Stephen E. Thorne
Angelo B. Costa	William J. Stevenson
John H. Cathcart	Robert E. Woolwine, Jr.
Richard J. Warnecke	Frank C. Blair, Jr.
Gordon L. Miller	Phillip R. Zeitsoff
Benjamin F. Haymes	Wilbert C. Manke
Emil A. Bolline	Warren E. Thornburg
Duane R. Shiffert	Frank J. Losey
Gilbert Klein	Fred L. Losee
Leonard L. Dalley	Glenn D. Richardson
Wendell J. Schwoerer	Wilbur J. Sunderman
Kenneth L. Morgan	Christopher E. Thomson, Jr.
Bill J. Harris	Charles C. Pruitt, Jr.
Lyndon M. Virkler	William P. Jones
Von Rue McAtee	Benson N. Redding
Robert J. McGuane	Thaddeus H. Williams
William H. Gibbons, Jr.	James W. Cummins
George W. Ferguson	Jackson F. McKinney
Albert L. Vogel, Jr.	Donald R. Bragg
Albert C. Matt	Frank S. Wozniak, Jr.
Frank S. Wozniak, Jr.	Frederic S. Hill
Roman G. Ziolkowski	

##### IN THE MARINE CORPS

##### PROMOTIONS

##### To be majors

Luther S. Moore  
Charles J. Schlaphohl  
Elliott E. Bard

##### To be first lieutenant

Henry A. Ellis, Jr.

##### To be second lieutenants

Frank X. Reagan	Beverly H. Spencer
Rupert C. Henley	Ralph A. Weller
Louis C. Griffin	William L. Bates, Jr.
Wallace Springstead	Thomas A. Durham, Jr.
Malcolm S. Crook	Ronald Jarvis, Jr.
Joseph T. Smith, Jr.	Edward B. Harrison
Richard M. Elliott	John I. Loy
Herbert E. Pierce	Wayne "D" Hudson
Raymond C. Portillo	

##### POSTMASTERS

##### INDIANA

William J. O'Donnell, Gary.  
Joseph P. Sullivan, Whiting.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Dennis Staton Inscow, Raleigh.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for the blessed gift of life, whose imperial spirit falls upon the homelands of the soul; grant that our great purpose shall be to live wisely, labor industriously, and at the last hand it back to Thee without blemish. In this wondering world we pray for a yearning sense of incompleteness; do Thou help us to stress the unrealized and thus grow in understanding and knowledge. Be pleased to fill up the open spaces of our characters with those fine aspirations and loves which shall never fail nor die.

Almighty God, an old world is dying, to us it will never be the same, a new one tarries to be born without legions, the triumph of the regal spirit of man. We wait, dear Lord, and pray for an early victory which shall bring the glad tidings of freedom from the suffering pangs of destitution and slavery. Oh prepare us for the use of an inevitable weapon in the progress of humanity, delivering us from the bludgeon of force. Let the aggressors against human freedom go down amid clouds as black as have ever been woven out of shame and dishonor. In the name of the Christ, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on November 9, 1942, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7491. An act to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines along and across certain parkway lands in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 7621. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### SIGNING OF TEEN-AGE BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 7528), an act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes upon the subject of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people are greatly agitated over the proposal to ration gasoline in the Midwestern and Central States. In my own State of Indiana the workers in defense plants, the farmers, the salesmen, the businessmen, and people of every avocation are distressed over this proposed rationing of gasoline, because it will have a very depressing effect upon business of every kind.

In my own State of Indiana, which receives its supply of oil and gasoline largely by pipe lines, there is no transportation problem involved, and there is no problem of using the railroads for this transportation of this needed commodity. However, if this proposed rationing of gasoline is carried out, it will directly impede business of every character, and it will, in the end, operate as an obstruction of our war effort.

I have received many letters and petitions from people of every walk in life upon this subject. They realize that this rationing in sections where it is unnecessary, and it appears to be wholly unnecessary in my home State of Indiana, will have a very depressing effect upon business of every type. It will take away the opportunity to aid in the prosecution of the war on the part of many of our citizens, and it will have a very destructive effect upon the many plants which are now engaged in producing war munitions and supplies.

Many of the people in my section of the country urge that this rationing be postponed for a period of 90 days, and that a careful study be made of this subject before action is taken to ration this commodity which will have such a disastrous effect upon the business of our country. The people want to contribute to our war effort, but this proposal to ration the commodity which is so essential to business of every type will certainly slow down both business and the war effort on the part of the people in my section of the country. If, at the end of 90 days, this proposed rationing is found to be necessary in any section of our country—then permit the rationing in that section to be applied. But the people are opposed to any rationing of gasoline in those sections where gasoline is plentiful, and where the commercial gasoline is being wasted and destroyed because of inadequate storage facilities. This rationing is wholly unnecessary in Indiana, because we have a surplus of gasoline. Therefore there should be no rationing in that section at this time.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, the 19th of November, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes after other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## THE LATE J. ZACH SPEARING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of the House, New Orleans lost one of its ablest and most valuable citizens, the Honorable J. Zach Spearing, who sat as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Second Congressional District of Louisiana from 1924 to 1931. Mr. Spearing was well known to many of the older Members of this Chamber. He was a great civic leader in the city of New Orleans, particularly in the field of public education, having served prior to coming to Congress as president of the Orleans Parish School Board. The monument to his life are the many contributions which he made to the cause of public education in our great city.

I join his many friends here in expressing to his family and relatives our sincere sympathy and sorrow at his passing. He lived to the ripe old age of 78.

By permission of the House I include herewith an editorial on Mr. Spearing from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of November 4, and also one from the New Orleans Item of November 3:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of November 4, 1942]

## J. ZACH SPEARING

Thousands of Orleanians account the passing of J. Zach Spearing a personal as well as a community loss. For that civic-spirited lawyer, during a long and useful career that included public service, philanthropic, and fraternal activities with the successful practice of his profession, made almost countless acquaintances that ripened into personal friendships. A lifelong friend of good causes, his zealous service in their behalf gave him wide contacts, won the confidence, appreciation, and liking of coworkers in many walks.

Born of New Orleans parents during the war of the sixties, Mr. Spearing was a lifelong resident of this city, receiving his preliminary education in its public schools, and graduating with high scholastic honors from Tulane University Law School in 1886. With his success as a lawyer and the demands of his private practice upon his time and abilities he retained his keen interest in civic affairs and found time for unselfish work in good causes.

For 8 years he was a member of the Orleans Parish school board, which made him its president. From 1916-20 he served on the State board of education. From the founding of the Times-Democrat—now the Times-Picayune—doll and toy fund he was a hardworking member of its general committee, and for the past 10 years the energetic chairman of its executive committee.

Elected to the Federal House in the middle 1920's to serve out an unexpired term, Mr. Spearing repeatedly was reelected "on his own," his congressional service extending from 1924 to 1931. Member of fraternal societies, social clubs, and carnival organizations, Mr. Spearing lived a full and interesting life, honored for his civic services and high professional character and ability, and enjoying a wide popularity earned by his kindly and engaging personal qualities. This newspaper joins in the sincere, community-wide tender of condolence to the surviving members of his family.

[From the New Orleans Item of November 3, 1942]

## J. ZACH SPEARING

A good man and a public-spirited citizen passes on in the death of Zach Spearing at the age of 78 years, all of which he lived actively until near the end. Graduating 56 years ago from Tulane's law school, he entered practice a few years later and remained in his profession uninterruptedly except for 12 years as a Member of Congress. His interest in public education was exemplified by 8 years of service on the Orleans school board, of which he became president in 1919, and also by 4 years as a member of the State board of education.

In politics he was his own man and made his affiliations as he pleased. That disposition made him a prominent and useful participant in more than one of the most important reform movements of the past 40 years. Adverse odds did not terrify him or prevent him from speaking his mind and acting accordingly.

Geniality and friendliness were among his most conspicuous traits. He was notable for charitable impulses, and, in particular, he loved children. His disposition made him a member of half a dozen fraternal organizations—of the Pickwick Club, the Orleans Country Club, carnival organizations, the Southern Yacht Club, and the Morphy Chess Club. Fishing and good cheer, often combined, were his favorite diversions. His brethren of the State and city bar esteemed him highly. And the wide range of his connections and friendships will make him many mourners.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech delivered by Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri, to the American Trucking Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an address by the Director of the Budget, Mr. Harold D. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## A SINGLE HEAD TO CONTROL OIL AND GAS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much regarding the rationing of gasoline. It seems to me that every indication points to the necessity for a single person at the head



of gasoline and oil. We have one for rubber, and the situation in respect to rubber is clearing up. Today we in Massachusetts, and even here in Washington, face real suffering this winter if something is not done. The discrimination against New England has been glaring. The situation has grown much worse instead of better. It is chaotic with three or four departments having control. There should not be a single passenger automobile used for pleasure in my opinion if it is going to involve loss of gasoline and oil for the troops or if it is going to mean that people are cold in New England and elsewhere during the winter. It is an entirely inexcusable situation and should be rectified at once. A single head control I believe would do it. Remember, this war can be lost without oil—action in this matter is long overdue. Fix the responsibility in one person and see that that person gets results.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MASON was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### TIRE RATIONING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Office of Price Administration a statement to be made out and sworn to, "Tire record and application for basic mileage ration, book A or D." This application blank requires the applicant's name, address, and serial numbers, and name of tires. I do not have any fault to find with any of this.

However, it seems to me we are fast, fast Russianizing this form of government of ours. Now let me quote the certification that one signs his name to:

I hereby certify that there is no gasoline ration book outstanding for use in connection with the motor vehicle herein described, except as listed above; that said motor vehicle is in use; that the tires on this vehicle will be kept in serviceable condition by repair and not operated beyond the recapping point; that I will not drive in excess of 35 miles per hour; that no passenger-car tires in excess of those listed above, except those mounted on other motor vehicles or equipment (including one spare per motor vehicle), are owned by the registered owner of the vehicle or by any person living in his household and related to him by blood, marriage, or adoption; and that all of the statements contained herein are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Then, beside the signature, in a square box in heavy black ink, you read the following:

Section 35 (A) of the United States Criminal Code makes it a criminal offense, punishable by a maximum of 10 years' imprisonment, \$10,000 fine, or both, to make a false statement or representation to any department or agency of the United States as to any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States.

In the above certification you state that the tires on the vehicle will be kept in serviceable condition by repair and not operated beyond the recapping point,

that you will not drive in excess of 35 miles per hour. Well, think of this. Anyone driving a car today knows that when his tires are worn out he is going to have a pretty difficult time to get new ones. In my opinion, the individual is going to do everything he can to look after his tires. So to me the enforced inspection does not mean very much, not any more than that the individual will have to pay several times a year to have his tires inspected. I wonder if that is really sound, sensible business for the Government and the rationing board.

Now, another statement:

I will not drive in excess of 35 miles per hour.

Certainly we drive carefully today to save gasoline. When we start down a hill and let the car idle, the first thing you know you are running over 35 miles per hour on the straightway where it does not require any gasoline and does not injure the tires. In an instance of this kind it seems foolish to me to retard the speed of the car and use the brakes, but if you do not, you are apt to exceed 35 miles per hour by some few miles and then are subject to 10 years' imprisonment or \$10,000 fine, or both. So great a penalty for so small an offense.

Gracious, goodness, what are we coming to? I realize we are in war, but is that any reason for these bureaucratic Government agencies to issue Government regulations of this kind and impair the efficiency of the Government in winning the war? Sometimes I wonder where we are headed internally in our Government. I do not believe a lot of these regulations that this administration is placing upon the people of this country are going to be for the good of the country, or the winning of the war, and I believe this regulation I call attention to is one of them. Mr. President, get rid of a lot of these brainbusters and let us get down to sane, sensible operation of our Government in wartime before it is too late.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks made earlier, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD two editorials from New Orleans newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the Minnesota Car Dealers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

#### THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR—ONE MORE CHANCE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to some the result of the election was a symptom of a mild, bloodless, political revolution, a repudiation of New Deal policies, of resentment of war losses. To others who, during the days preceding the election, met the home folks in town hall, schoolhouse, on the street corner, or in their homes, it was evidence that, unless Washington mends its ways, there will be a revolution of a different character. A revolution that will not be bloodless, a revolution which may be a repetition of the French Revolution.

This last statement may seem an exaggeration, but to those of us who grasped the hands and looked into the faces of the parents, the wives, the sweethearts, who have sent their loved ones to die in distant lands, it is alarmingly accurate.

The questions which will be here asked, the statements which will be here made are but the repetition of questions which were asked, statements which were made by this, that, or the other individual or group during the campaign. When I state that Washington is on trial, I mean that the administration, the President of the United States, his advisers, the bureaucrats, and the Federal agencies, and, please note this, the Congress of the United States, are all on trial.

#### REPUBLICANS NEED NOT CONGRATULATE EACH OTHER

Some Republicans, notably so-called leaders, hail the election returns as a tribute to their astuteness. Never was a group more mistaken. In this election the leaders did not lead; the people pushed them along or out. In what is here said, no claim is made that it is an expression of all or even of a majority of the people of the district I represent. What was plain is that it was the voice of a number of the people expressing agreement with each and every statement made and that each and every statement came from an earnest, conscientious, loyal American, determined to win the war, but to put an end to all those things which are hindering the war effort, which threaten the destruction of our form of government.

#### THE ELECTION RESULT DUE TO RESENTMENT

The election result, in the judgment of those with whom I have since talked, in my own judgment, was due not to any aggressive, constructive, policy on the part of the Republican organization, but to resentment because of the manner in which the New Deal first wasted the money of the taxpayers and since the war began has devoted a large share of its effort toward the advancement of its own political interest at the expense of preparedness and an efficient carrying on of the war.

For almost 10 years the new dealers have been guilty of waste, extravagance, and inefficiency. They have deliberately circumscribed and reduced the liberty of the citizen. They have been guilty of granting special privileges to powerful political groups in return for political support. The administration, and that includes the President himself, has ex-

tended special favors to labor politicians, and to labor racketeers at the expense of the average citizen through the denial of protection of constitutional rights to American workers—American citizens.

#### FOREIGN POLICY NOT APPROVED

The people with whom I talked had no admiration for the provocative foreign policy of the President which did not keep us out of war. They had no patience with the policy of the President which followed a line which day after day and month after month threw us ever nearer the war and which in the end permitted us to become involved in the war unprepared.

#### FORGIVEN BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

The people to whom I refer are willing to forgive the administration's folly, its mistakes, its stupidity which occurred prior to Pearl Harbor, but they have no patience with and they will not tolerate any charges of lack of patriotism on the part of those who were pro-American, who wanted to prepare for national defense, who wanted to avoid war. They have no patience with, and they are resentful toward, those rabid interventionists with financial connections abroad; those who are more interested in preserving and increasing our opportunities for world trade than they are in maintaining our constitutional rights, in preserving the "four freedoms" here at home.

#### THE PEOPLE BELIEVE IN AMERICA

The people have no patience with those, however high-minded they may be, who would join the whole world in a common brotherhood—by the sword force the people of India—all other peoples—to accept our or England's political theories of government. They are angry—deeply angry—at those who tell us that after this war is over—that after the victory has been won—the American farmer must furnish a quart of milk to every inhabitant of the world; that the American farmer must furnish the raw materials to feed and to clothe every individual member of a world-wide population, even though they choose to sit in idleness.

They have become resentful toward those who tell us that we must not only finance this war; that millions or more of our young men, the pride of our land, must die on foreign soil, playing the game of the world, but that we must feed and finance the world after the war.

#### REMEMBER—WE ARE PRO-AMERICAN

If those internationalists who live along the eastern seaboard have the idea that the patience of the American people is inexhaustible; that the financial interests of the East, with their foreign connections; that the great corporations, with their interlocking boards of directors on which sit financiers from the Old World, which are in effect but the tail on the dog, are, after our armies have been successful, going to wag the dog, they better prepare for a war here at home. The Middle West has fought. The Middle West can fight. The Middle West will fight for the preservation of a national independent constitutional

government, and if the small group of internationalists who think they see in this war an opportunity to destroy our national existence—make us a part of a super united states of the world—have such an idea in the back of their heads, they better get rid of it or prepare to do some fighting themselves.

Women and men who have lost their loved ones in this struggle are going to fight with a fury and a determination that has never been surpassed to preserve here in America the liberty declared in Independence Hall, won by the barefoot, half-famished soldiers of the Revolution.

Yes; the people with whom I talked during the campaign are back of this war, not because they believe it was necessary, not because they believe it was inevitable, not because they believe it is being fought to preserve the so-called American way of life, but they are back of it because we are in it and they are determined that it shall be won.

As one sailor on furlough from active duty said to me at one of those meetings, after he asked me, "For what are we fighting?" and I had suggested that some answers might tend to impair his fighting spirit he made answer, "Mr. HOFFMAN, nothing that can be said will lessen our determination to win this war, but we know" and by "we" he meant the boys on his ship—"that we are not fighting for the 'four freedoms' here at home." He further said that unless we watch those in Washington, we will lose those "four freedoms," find them absent when we return. Then he said, "We are going to win this war; we are going to fight until it is won; but when we come back, the people in Washington are going to answer to us."

An ensign from the Navy on leave for the first time in 5 months, with a brother in the service, made a similar statement to me.

A mother who came up with tears in her eyes to grasp my hand and urge me to fight for the maintenance of our constitutional form of government, a woman who had lost one son, who had two others in the armed force, made a similar statement.

#### BACK OF THE WAR?

Yes; our people are back of the war, but they have not been fooled as to why or how we became involved. Nor have they any mistaken notion as to the issue involved. They are not unaware of what the Communists and the new dealers will do to this Government of ours if they are given an opportunity. Our people know that this administration is not devoting its undivided efforts to the winning of the war, nor to war production.

Our people are aware that the President is now calling for an armed force of 9,500,000 by the end of 1943. They have been told by the Brookings Institution that it will be necessary to increase the number of workers by 6,400,000 persons. That even if the administration plan to import 150,000 Mexican workers goes through, the increase in the armed force will make it necessary to employ 60 per-

cent of the average nonfarm housewives over 45 years of age without children in war industries; that 15 percent of the youth between 14 and 19 who would normally be in school and 15 percent of the workers who normally retire from work will be required to serve in industries. They know, too, that to support the armed force demanded by the President it will be necessary to establish an average 40-hour week for all workers—men and women, young and old. They know that even when all these demands have been met the production of goods for civilian use will have to be reduced by one-third. The people know that this administration so far has not permitted Congress to take the steps necessary to support such an armed force.

Our people who have seen the land stripped of those who must furnish the labor to supply the food for the armed force and the civilian population is to live know that failure awaits us if that policy is not changed.

Our farmers whose young men have gone to the war, who have been forced to give up the cultivation of the land, are impatient when they learn that Walter Reuther has been deferred from military service. Walter Reuther is the man who when in Russia with his brother wrote back to his comrades in Detroit that they should "fight for a Soviet America." Walter Reuther is the man who was one of the leaders in the bloody violence during the sit-down strikes in Flint, Mich., in 1937. Walter Reuther is the man who has been in the forefront in so many of the strikes, the beatings, and the slug-gings which have held up production in Michigan, which intimidated law-abiding citizens.

Walter Reuther is the man who is the pet of this administration and he is the man who has so often instigated action in violation of our laws. Yet he escapes combat service through the action of a Federal agency while the farmers' sons march off to war. Reuther remains here at home to create dissension in the ranks of the workers—carry on political campaigns in behalf of the New Deal, smear Republican candidates while other men are dying in defense of our country.

Our people are disgusted because the President takes under his protection the notorious Walter Winchell, known by hundreds of thousands of our people to be a dirty, lying spreader of scandalous gossip and of false charges.

Our people are astounded when they learn that the Communist, Earl Browder, the leader of the Communist Party in America, twice convicted and sentenced to prison, released by the order of the President himself, goes without rebuke from the President to the city of Chicago and assails the patriotism of Senator Brooks, a veteran seven times wounded in the First World War, solely because Brooks was a candidate for United States Senator on the Republican ticket.

I say the absurdity of it! It outrages the sense of decency of every patriotic American here.

The people in my district did not vote for me because they like me; they do



not; they tell me so to my face. They did not vote for me because they think I am smart; they know I am not; they voted for me because they know I represent here in Washington their convictions; that is why they voted, by the largest percentage—69 percent of the vote cast—the largest percentage that was ever given, to send me back. Do not make any mistake about this. There is no conceit in my mind; I am not deceived about that vote. I do not take it as a compliment; it was not; it was a repudiation of some of the things that have been going on not only in the administration down here at the other end of the Avenue, but right here in Congress. It was a vote of protest against our lack of courage to meet and deal with the situation which confronts us.

The President is free with his quips, his jests, his smart remarks, he is free with his criticism, his insinuations of a lack of patriotism on the part of his opponents, but we fail to find that he has ever criticized by a single word the dirty, nasty Winchell, the convicted Browder, or Walter Reuther, the advocate of violence, a defiance of the law, the denial of constitutional rights to American workers.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. COX. Maybe this Congress will straighten itself out before the end of the war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we could have an election every 6 weeks, Congress would get straightened out; but when we get elected we come down here and on the first day we are here what do we hear? Over on our side we congratulate each other on the big vote we got and we tell each other how smart we were to get it. Those on the other side possibly may shed a few tears that this one or that one will not be back again, but contend it will not be long before they will return. But we do not get down to business and do what is necessary to straighten out the trouble. I venture to predict to the gentleman from Georgia that we are not going to do anything about straightening out the labor situation until the people get after us again.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. COX. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that there are serious Members of the House who belong to the Democratic Party, who are unwilling merely for the sake of conformity to continue to be forced into attitudes that do violence to their sense of obligation to principle and to the Constitution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand that. I know what the gentleman is going to say. You will find it in an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune of yesterday, which pays tribute to some of the southern Members of this House. I hope the gentleman will put it in the Record.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Nearly every Sunday night we listen to some of the speeches of Walter Winchell, and in all of his tirades he directs attention to the gentleman from Michigan. I would like to know what success the gentleman from Michigan had in his district; what his majority was, and so forth. I would like to know that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the last Presidential year, with the wonderful Willkie oratory and all that, the vote for Congressman was 61 percent. This time it was 69 percent of the total vote.

Mr. Speaker, do not misunderstand me. We are back of this war, to the very last word, to the very last thought, to the very last deed. But I have no patience and our people have no patience with this policy of the administration, which hinders war production. That vote was not a Republican partisan vote—Democrats voted that way. It was a protest—an anti-New Deal vote.

When the reporters called the President's attention to the strikes which were interfering with war production, and he asked, "What strikes?" well might they have answered, "Mr. President, we refer to the strikes instigated and carried on by your protégé, Walter Reuther."

The people are bewildered by a policy which takes their 19- and 20-year-old boys and forces them into combat forces while at the same time it refuses to write into the law calling them to service a provision guaranteeing that they have adequate training before fighting. Their bewilderment is not lessened when they learn from a news dispatch from Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, that at the ill-fated Hong Kong expedition where nearly 2,000 Canadians were lost to the invading Japanese, an investigating commission of the Canadian Government admitted that some of the troops were inadequately trained and lacked mechanical transport.

With the teen-age boys being drafted for combat service, with no guaranty of adequate training written into the law, they wonder why it is that thousands upon thousands of apparently physically fit men of draft age are in soft jobs in the Federal Government. They just cannot understand why other thousands of union men are permitted to remain in positions of security, working a normal workweek of 40 hours, while their boys from the farms, who work 12, 14, and sometimes longer hours, are taken from essential food production.

Their bewilderment is increased when, turning their hands to war production on the farm, they find themselves powerless because the young men have gone to the war, because they themselves can no longer get adequate farm equipment and then read, as you and I read, accounts of strikes, slowdowns, and work stoppages in our factories. Amazed and shocked are they by these news reports similar to the one which this morning confronted me when I picked up the Washington Times-Herald and under black lines, "Building unions take holiday," learned that "thousands on United States jobs here quit work." And why did these thousands on November 11, Armistice Day, quit work here in the city

of Washington? They quit work because working on Armistice Day they were not to receive pay and a half instead of regular pay—for example, a dollar and a half instead of the regular dollar an hour.

The boys fighting in Africa, in the Solomon Islands, all over the world, on every continent, on every sea, did not lay down their guns yesterday, on Armistice Day. Yet here in Washington, on the President's doorstep as it were, thousands of workers on Government jobs, one of which was the \$70,000,000 war building, quit, refused to work yesterday just because they were not given pay and a half. Their action is due, similar action in the past has been due to the coddling, the political conniving of this administration with labor politicians and racketeers.

#### AN END TO SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

Not a farmer, not a laboring man, not a man behind the counter or in business in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan is unaware of the hard, cruel fact that this administration is behind the policy which makes the American taxpayer pay a wage and a half for every gun, tank, ship, and plane which is produced in the 8 hours which follows the 40 hours of work in 1 week.

None is there who does not realize that every implement of war produced in this country is, because of the policy of the President and his administration, if it be produced on a holiday or Sunday, made to cost twice what it would otherwise cost. There is neither man nor woman nor school child 14 years of age who thinks on the subject who does not realize that after those in munitions factories have worked on war production 40 hours a week, if they work 8 hours more, produce one-third less for the same money than they would if we had a longer workweek. No one is so dumb that he does not understand and resent the administration's policy which for a given number of dollars gives us half as much war production on holidays and Sundays as we would get for the same amount of money were that policy not enforced. Double pay for war work, here at home—a dollar or \$2 an hour just does not make sense to the parents of the boy who is fighting in Africa for \$60 a month. The war cannot be won on a 40-hour week nor on pay and a half or double pay for those in safe jobs here at home.

While all know that there is this hampering of the war effort not all have understood why it has been permitted in wartime to continue. However, many do know and many at the polls expressed their disapproval by their ballots—many do know that this situation exists because in return for these special favors granted to labor leaders and labor racketeers the administration expects to get and has had the political support of those labor leaders. A more corrupt war hampering procedure it would be difficult to imagine.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I take it that the gentleman is of a disposition to join hands with others who feel they are really serv-

ants of the people to prevent this continuation of effort to reform the country completely into a state of socialist dictatorship?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listen, time and time again in the primary, time and time again in the campaign, I told the people to whom I was talking, that for 6 years down here the battle has not been between Republicans and Democrats, but that the fight has been between Republicans and Democrats on the one side and Communists and new dealers on the other. And there is where I stand. I am ready to join hands with the Democrats who stand for constitutional government any and at all times.

#### CONGRESS HAS FAILED TO LISTEN

The Republican Party has not as yet, nor have the Democrats in Congress as yet, listened to the resentment which has been growing against that kind of procedure throughout the country. True, the House twice has passed legislation which would have tended to remedy the situation. But the other body across the Capitol, under the influence of the President, has refused to even vote upon that legislation.

There is now pending before the House the Hobbs bill, so-called, which would aid in preventing racketeering which hinders the war effort but it has been buried by the leadership of this House and that has caused resentment.

#### WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

Yes, the people are back of this war and they mean to win it. There is, throughout the country wherever I have been, a grim determination to do three things—to win the war—to preserve our American form of government—and to hold to strict account the administration and the Congress of the United States.

The people know that an army cannot be fed if the farms are stripped of those who must cultivate the land. Yet that is being done by this administration. The people know that taxes cannot be paid if 300,000 small businessmen are put out of existence. The people know that the cost of the war will be prohibitive and that it cannot be won if special favors are to continue to be shown to the racketeering, political leaders of organized labor. Some people believe that this administration to date has been more interested in preserving its political alliance with labor than it has been in devoting its efforts to winning the war. The people will accept, if that be necessary, all sorts of restrictions, all kinds of rationing, the making of every sacrifice demanded, if the administration and the Congress will get about its business of winning the war; of preserving the American Government and give assurance that our men will be returned to their homes when the war has been won, here to find still in existence the Constitution of the United States—still flying the Stars and Stripes—Old Glory.

If this administration and I include the President, and this Congress and that means all of us, do not get about the peoples' business wholeheartedly, there will be an accounting in the not too distant future and some of us may answer

as did the thoughtless, and the heedless in the days of the French Revolution.

#### PAY DAY IS COMING

The people of America are patient; they are long-suffering; they are God-fearing; but let them once be convinced that their freedom is at stake; that their Government is playing politics with the lives of their boys, and retribution will be swift and sure and terrible in its consequences.

It is long past time when all Americans, good, bad, or indifferent, either come to the aid of their country or take the consequences.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INDEPENDENCE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 885)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes", I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the fifth report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940, and ending June 30, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 12, 1942.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on next Monday after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of a distinguished American who died recently on his eighty-ninth birthday and to include therein certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

#### SILVER LEGISLATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will soon be called upon to reconsider and repeal all silver legislation now on the statute books as the result of a well-financed and an insidious campaign that has been carried on through various publications in this country. To my mind, this is such an important issue to the American people and involves such far-reaching benefits to business and to the people of this country that a thorough investigation of the whole subject of the use of silver as money should be conducted by this House. I have been unable to get the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to conduct such an investigation.

You will find in the RECORD of November 11, as a sample of the kind of campaign that is being carried on against the best interests of the American people and the only profitable fiscal operation of the Treasury, a statement which is a condensation of the newspaper articles appearing here in Washington, as a part of the campaign to influence the Congress and stampede its Members into repealing the only money-creating program of the Treasury on which our Government is making a profit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. Boggs asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 12, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. PADDOCK.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.



The Clerk read House Resolution 571 as follows:

*Resolved*, That EVAN HOWELL, of Illinois, is hereby elected to membership on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### RELATIONS BETWEEN THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND INDIA

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to note that a member of another body, speaking in Boston yesterday, took the Prime Minister of Great Britain to task for his statement that he was not appointed or selected to liquidate the British Empire.

For some time now we have had these attacks on Great Britain, our chief ally in this war, because of the way she handles her internal affairs.

In 1926 the Premiers of the British Dominions met in London and adopted a conference report setting out the status of the various members. I inserted that report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you will find it at page 2552 of the RECORD of January 29, 1927. In that report they called attention to the status of India and said that the relationship between India and Great Britain was governed by the act of India of 1919. That act has been renewed recently by an act of the British Parliament. Yet we find members of another body and the man presuming to hold himself out as the titular leader of the Republican Party directly and indirectly attacking the British Empire, which means the British association of nations, because of the conditions that prevail in India and her relationship to the British Empire.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman an explanation of the fact that all extreme left-wingers, crackpots, and Communists advocate the dismemberment of the British Empire?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I have only one explanation, and that is that they must be Marxist revolutionists.

In arguing a case before the Supreme Court of the United States on last Monday, in which he attempted to show that a Communist who belonged to an organization dedicated to the overthrow of this Government and who had been preaching revolution throughout the country should not be denied citizenship in the United States for that reason, Mr. Wendell L. Willkie went back and quoted the words of Thomas Jefferson and also the words of Abraham Lincoln. I submit that it was a desecration of the names and of the memories, if you please, of those two illustrious statesmen to try to twist their words or their meanings to justify an argument in favor of a Marxist and Communist revolutionist, who is in favor of destroying everything for which you and I stand.

Thomas Jefferson was not a Marxist revolutionist. He was using the words

of Jefferson wherein Jefferson was not advocating Marxism or communism but merely a separation of the American Colonies from the British Empire, sustained by George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, and all the other great conservatives of that day.

The words of Mr. Lincoln he quoted you will find were uttered on January 12, 1848. Mr. Lincoln was not advocating Marxism and revolution but he was justifying the secession of Texas from Mexico. The reason I am so familiar with that text is that we use it often to show that while the Southern States did not have the power to maintain their secession, they had the right to make the attempt. We do not deny that if India should separate herself from the British Empire that she would have the right to do so, but that is a matter between India and the British Empire and is none of our affair.

If we are going to win this war, and we must win it, I submit there must be the closest possible relationship between the United States and her English-speaking Allies. Under this conference report adopted in 1926, these British Dominions virtually declared their independence.

Something I seldom do in this House is to read my own remarks, but I will read this statement that I made then:

Mr. Speaker, during the months of October and November of last year a convention of the premiers, or representatives, of the various dominions of the British Empire, was held in London for the purpose of settling and defining their relations to the British Empire and to each other. The report of the committee on interimperial relations which was finally adopted constitutes one of the most far-reaching documents of modern times. With the possible exception of the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, it is perhaps the most important document of its kind ever promulgated by the English-speaking race.

I stand by that statement. Those Dominions are subject to no compulsion whatsoever, but they have maintained their relationship with the British Empire, and their loyalty to the British Commonwealth of Nations, because it is their only hope of existence. Suppose someone here should rise up and suggest that Australia should be turned loose, as they say about India, and suppose Australia had been cast adrift without a navy, where would Australia be today—a small country from the standpoint of population? A country of the bravest people under the sun, but small in numbers, would have been cast to the mercy of the Japanese war lords. What would have become of the Commonwealth of South Africa, that great English-speaking country that we all love and admire so much? What would have become of New Zealand under the same circumstances? Of course, Canada is close enough to the United States that she could not be imposed upon. Yet these men come now, when Great Britain is fighting for her very existence, and take Prime Minister Churchill to task for saying that it is not his job nor his intention to liquidate the British Empire!

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does the gentleman remember that Mr. Willkie prefaced his remarks on India by saying that he did not know anything about it, and then went on and discussed the matter for a longer time than any other part of his talk?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, Mr. Willkie knows so little about so many things that he ought to have no prejudice about them, and India is not an exception.

Mr. Speaker, suppose Great Britain or some one representing her should say that they are not satisfied with what the United States is doing with reference to our holdings. Suppose she were to say that the United States must turn Puerto Rico loose. Suppose she were to say we have no right to hold Alaska, that it should go back to Russia. They have just as much right to make that statement, in response to some outcry, as we have to say that Great Britain should dismember her Empire in the midst of this the greatest war the world has ever seen.

Suppose she were to say that the United States must get rid of Florida, and turn it back to the Spaniards or to the Indians. Suppose she were to say that the United States must get rid of Texas, and turn it back to Mexico, or get rid of California and turn it back to Mexico. She has exactly the same right to interfere with our internal affairs as we have to interfere with hers. I, for one, do not agree with those men who go out under these circumstances and align themselves with the communistic element in this country as well as the communistic element in India, that would give the British Empire trouble, which would mean trouble for us and all of our Allies during these trying times.

Great Britain has her form of government and she is not going to give it up. We have our form of government and our institutions, and our way of life, and we are not going to surrender them. We do not want any revolution in America, and I do not relish the words of men in high places who go out and talk about this being a "people's revolution." This is not a revolution we are carrying on; it is a war between the United States, England, and those Allies fighting with us, and the dictatorships of Germany and Japan and Italy, and the countries associated with them.

The greatest blessing mankind has ever known from a governmental standpoint is the Government of the United States, and next to that is the Government of the British Empire. Probably a Britisher would put it the other way around and say the world's greatest blessing has been the British Empire and that next to that would be the Government of the United States. The British Empire built representative government. It was not created by Magna Carta. It was created by those old Whigs in the British Parliament, who fought and struggled until representative government as we know it was established for the people of Great Britain, and along with it came the development of the common law, and then, with the Declaration of Independence, and the

Constitution of the United States with its Bill of Rights, we have perfected a system of government surpassing anything else the world has ever seen. And we are not going to give it up. The English-speaking race that built this civilization, that built our form of government, is fighting for its very life, its very existence, which means the future civilization of mankind.

I question the wisdom of any man in high place who stands up and argues that these revolutionists ought to be put on a par with American citizens, or that we ought to interfere with the internal affairs of the greatest ally we have, the British Commonwealth of Nations. We are not seeking other people's territory, but we are not asking foreigners who come to our shores to revamp or revise our Government before they learn to speak our language.

I feel as Washington did at Valley Forge when he passed the word down to put only Americans on guard. I believe that this is the time when those of us who believe in the Constitution of the United States, those of us who believe in the fundamental principles of the common law, those of us who believe in the perpetuation of our free institutions should stand up in this House and elsewhere and answer those who peddle the dangerous doctrine that the men who established this Government or preserved it were Marxist revolutionists, and that we ought to repudiate our own system of government or destroy the system of government of one of our allies.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. For a question only.

Mr. WHITE. In view of the recent trends, does the gentleman feel we are progressing toward a more liberal form of government?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that we are in a war now, and if we maintain our form of government I think we will be lucky. That is what I am for. I am tired of somebody away off yonder trying to tell us how to run our own internal affairs.

Those millions of our boys in the service understand that we are fighting, not to destroy our institutions, not to turn them over to some flannel-mouth crackpots who want to destroy everything that we hold sacred and dear, but to maintain that which our forefathers built and that which we have always enjoyed, so that when they come back, as I said the other day, they will find the same flag flying at the same place and over the same institutions our forefathers established and maintained with their own blood and their own sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the address of Prime Minister Churchill, to which these critics refer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

I notice, my Lord Mayor, by your speech you had reached the conclusion that news from the various fronts has been somewhat better lately.

In our wars, episodes are largely adverse but the final result has hitherto been satisfactory. Eddies swirl around us, but the tide bears us forward on its broad, restless flood.

In the last war we were uphill almost to the end. We met with continual disappointments and with disasters far more bloody than anything we have experienced so far in this. But in the end all oppositions fell together and our foes submitted themselves to our will.

We have not so far in this war taken as many German prisoners as they have taken British, but these German prisoners will, no doubt, come in in droves at the end, just as they did last time.

I have never promised anything but blood, tears, toil, and sweat. Now, however, we have a new experience. We have victory—a remarkable and definite victory. The bright gleam has caught the helmets of our soldiers and warmed and cheered all our hearts.

The late M. Venizelos observed that in all her wars England—she should have said Britain, of course—always won one battle, the last. It would seem to have begun rather earlier this time.

#### THE BATTLE OF EGYPT

General Alexander, with his brilliant comrade and lieutenant, General Montgomery, has made a glorious and decisive victory in what I think should be called the Battle of Egypt. Rommel's army has been defeated. It has been routed. It has been very largely destroyed as a fighting force.

This battle was not fought for the sake of gaining positions or so many square miles of desert territory. General Alexander and General Montgomery fought it with one single idea—to destroy the armed forces of the enemy and to destroy them at a place where the disaster would be most punishable and irrevocable.

All the various elements in our lines of battle played their part. Indian troops, Fighting French, Greeks, representatives of Czechoslovakia, and others. Americans rendered powerful and invaluable service in the air. But as it happened, as the course of battle turned, it has been fought throughout almost entirely by men of British blood and from the dominions on the one side and by Germans on the other. The Italians were left to perish in the waterless desert. But the fighting between the British and Germans was intense and fierce in the extreme.

It was a deadly battle. The Germans have been outmatched and outfought with every kind of weapons with which they had beaten down so many small peoples, and, also, larger, unprepared peoples. They have been beaten by many of the technical apparatus on which they counted to gain domination of the world. Especially is this true in the air, as of tanks and of artillery, which has come back into its own. The Germans have received that measure of fire and steel which they have so often meted out to others.

#### END OF THE BEGINNING

Now, this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning.

Hitler's Nazis will be equally well armed, and, perhaps, better armed. But henceforward they will have to face in many theaters that superiority in the air which they have so often used without mercy against others and of which they boasted all around the world that they were to be masters and which they intended to use as an instrument for convincing all other peoples that all resistance to them was hopeless.

When I read of the coastal road crammed with fleeing German vehicles under the blasting attacks of the Royal Air Force, I could not but remember those roads of France and Flanders crowded with fighting men, but with helpless refugees, women and children, fleeing with their pitiful barrows and

household goods upon whom such merciless havoc was wreaked. I have, I trust, a humane disposition, but I must say I could not help feeling that whatever was happening, however grievous, was only justice grimly repaid.

It will be my duty in the near future to give a particular and full account of these operations. All I say about them at present is that the victory which has already been gained gives good prospects of becoming decisive and final, so far as the defense of Egypt is concerned.

#### ACTION BY UNITED STATES

But this Battle of Egypt, in itself so important, was designed and timed as a prelude and a counterpart of the momentous enterprise undertaken by the United States at the western end of the Mediterranean, an enterprise under United States command and in which our Army, Air Force, and, above all, our Navy are bearing an honorable and important share. A very full account has been published of all that has been happening in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia.

The President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the armed forces of America, is the author of this mighty undertaking and in all of it I have been his active and ardent lieutenant.

You have, no doubt, read the declaration of President Roosevelt, solemnly endorsed by His Majesty's Government, of the strict respect which will be paid to the rights and interests of Spain and Portugal, both by America and Great Britain.

To those countries, our only policy is that they shall be independent and free, prosperous and at peace. Britain and the United States will do all that we can to enrich the economic life of the Iberian Peninsula. The Spaniards, especially, with all their troubles require and deserve peace and recuperation.

#### FRANCE UNDER THE NAZI HEEL

Our thoughts turn toward France, groaning in bondage under the German heel. Many ask themselves the question: Is France finished? Is that long and famous history, marked by so many manifestations of genius, bearing with it so much that is precious to culture, to civilization and, above all, to the liberties of mankind—is all that now to sink forever into the ocean of the past, or will France rise again and resume her rightful place in the structure of what may one day be again the family of Europe?

I gladly say here, on this considerable occasion, even now when misguided or suborned Frenchmen are firing upon their rescuers, that I am prepared to stake my faith that France will rise again.

While there are men like General de Gaulle and all those who follow him—and they are legion throughout France—and men like General Giraud, that gallant warrior whom no prison can hold, while there are men like that to stand forward in the name and in the cause of France my confidence in the future of France is sure.

For ourselves we have no wish but to see France free and strong, with her Empire gathered round her and with Alsace-Lorraine restored. We covet no French possession. We have no acquisitive designs or ambitions in North Africa or any other part of the world. We have not entered this war for profit or expansion but only for honor and to do our duty in defending the right.

#### BRITAIN TO HOLD HER OWN

Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter: we mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. For that task, if ever it were prescribed, someone else would have to be found, and under a democracy I suppose the nation would have to be consulted.

I am proud to be a member of that vast commonwealth and society of nations and



communities gathered in and around the ancient British monarchy, without which the good cause might well have perished from the face of the earth.

Here we are and here we stand, a veritable rock of salvation in this drifting world. There was a time not long ago when for a whole year we stood all alone. Those days, thank God, have gone.

We now move forward in a great and gallant company. For our record we have nothing to fear. We have no need to make excuses or apologies. Our record pleads for us and we shall get gratitude in the breasts of every man and woman in every part of the world.

As I have said, in this war we have no territorial aims. We desire no commercial favors, we wish to alter no sovereignty or frontier for our own benefit.

We have come into North Africa shoulder to shoulder with our American friends and allies for one purpose and one purpose only. Namely, to gain a vantage ground from which to open a new front against Hitler and Hitlerism, to cleanse the shores of Africa from the stain of Nazi and Fascist tyranny, to open the Mediterranean to Allied sea power and air power, and thus effect the liberation of the peoples of Europe from the pit of misery into which they have been passed by their own improvidence and by the brutal violence of the enemy.

#### SINGLE POLITICAL CONCEPTION

These two African undertakings, in the east and in the west, were part of a single strategic and political conception which we had labored long to bring to fruition and about which we are now justified in entertaining good and reasonable confidence. Taken together they were a grand design, vast in its scope, honorable in its motive and noble in its aim.

British and American forces continue to prosper in the Mediterranean. The whole event will be a new bond between the English-speaking people and a new hope for the whole world.

I recall to you some lines of Byron which seem to me to fit event and theme:

"Millions of tongues record thee, and anew  
Their children's lips shall echo them and say,  
Here where sword the united nations drew  
Our countrymen were warring on that day.  
And this is much and all which will not  
pass away."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert an article by a columnist in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### PUERTO RICO

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of the House to the plight in which Puerto Rico finds itself. Puerto Rico is an island of 3,500 square miles, with a population of about 1,884,000 people. Puerto Rico today is doing everything possible to assist in the war against the Axis. It is giving everything it has. Its greatest contribution has been in manpower. So great has been that contribution that Puerto Rico is the only place in the United States where no draft is necessary. Puerto Rico's draft quota has been filled exclusively by volunteers, and there is always a large number of volunteers waiting to be accepted in the Army.

Puerto Rico finds itself today in a plight which in some respects is worse than the plight of some of the conquered nations. The war has brought about an economic situation in Puerto Rico which is the most pitiable that we have witnessed in its entire history. Prior to the war Puerto Rico was receiving monthly over 100,000 tons of shipments. Today, after frantic appeals to our Shipping Board, less than 30,000 tons of foodstuffs are reaching Puerto Rico each month.

Now, let us pause a moment and see what are the food staples of the Puerto Ricans. Beans, rice, codfish. Dealing with the latter, may I inform my colleagues that all of the codfish supply in Newfoundland was purchased prior to Pearl Harbor by the Portuguese Government. It has been openly charged and never denied that this codfish is being distributed by the Portuguese to Nazi Germany. In Puerto Rico there is therefore no supply whatever of codfish. On the docks in New Orleans there are tons and tons of rice. I have before me a report of October 24, by Mr. Paul Edwards, administrator of W. P. A. in Puerto Rico, in which it is stated that in Puerto Rico there is practically no rice. The normal consumption of rice in Puerto Rico is about 18,000,000 pounds per month.

Prices have gone sky high. For instance, let me read from an index recently prepared by the Office of Statistics, by Mr. S. L. Descartes, of the Governor's office of statistics in Puerto Rico. I shall read only a portion dealing with beans, just to give you an example. It reads as follows:

The decline in beans was due to a drop from 12 cents to 10 cents in price per pound of the imported pink beans which are the ones consumed in largest quantity in Puerto Rico, but the locally produced white beans rose from 13 cents to 14 cents a pound, and locally produced red beans from 12 cents to 14 cents a pound. The greatest increase in starchy vegetables was that of taniers which rose from 5 cents to 7 cents. Sweetpotatoes rose from 3 cents to 3.5 cents a pound and plantains .25—that is one-quarter of a cent—to 3 cents per unit.

The index of the retail cost of foodstuffs in Puerto Rico increased to .196 on October 14 compared to .189 on September 15.

So you have today in Puerto Rico a most serious food shortage and, literally speaking, thousands and thousands of families in Puerto Rico are facing starvation. Even such articles as soap and matches are practically nonexistent in Puerto Rico today. Besides the food shortage you have such prices as place whatever food supply there is on or may reach the island of Puerto Rico beyond the reach of the purchasing power of the people of Puerto Rico. Let us see what that purchasing power is. When a Puerto Rican is employed his average annual wage is a little over two hundred dollars. Puerto Rico is the only territory over which our flag flies where there has been no war boom at all, and by that I mean there are no war industries. Further, the gasoline shortage has almost paralyzed the life of the country as Puerto Rico depends primarily on motor vehicles for its transportation. There was some work some time ago when we were building our landing fields and various other military construction was go-

ing on; there was some employment then, but all this military construction has been completed and the result is that as of the end of September 1942, according to the W. P. A. report filed here by its director in Puerto Rico, Mr. Paul Edwards, there were 240,000 unemployed persons on the island. The report submitted to the Governor of Puerto Rico by the Committee on Unemployment, prior to that showed that there were 176,000 unemployed. Since this report of September 1942 was submitted it has been estimated that unemployment in Puerto Rico has now reached the figure of approximately 325,000 people, affecting about 165,000 families.

I realize, of course, that to most of us here in Congress Puerto Rico is a far, far away place, but Puerto Rico to us from a very realistic standpoint is most important, so important that we have spent many millions of dollars to fortify it so as to make it the Gibraltar of the Caribbean. It is also very vital to us from the standpoint of winning this war when we bear in mind that Puerto Rico is a very important link in the chain of Western Hemispheric solidarity. It has been so since the early days of Spanish colonialism, when Puerto Rico was the vanguard of the West Indies. The people of Puerto Rico are Latin Americans; they are an integral part of the great 100,000,000 Latin Americans. A most important factor in this war are the 100,000,000 Latin Americans and their 20 Latin-American nations. To permit this condition to exist in Puerto Rico, to let this situation continue in Puerto Rico, is going to do more damage to Western Hemispheric solidarity, it is going to plunge a deeper wedge in our Latin-American front than a thousand Nazi submarines in the Caribbean or in the waters around North and South America.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman spoke of high prices which are working a tremendous hardship on the great masses of Puerto Ricans. I am wondering if anything is being done to hold down these prices or put a ceiling on prices in the interest of that class of people that is unable to pay such fancy prices.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am coming to that. I have just been picturing the conditions as they exist down there. I am going to discuss what efforts have been made and then point out what I think should be done.

Office of Price Administration, the Department of the Interior, and the Agricultural Marketing Administration have been grappling with this problem, but first let us analyze the problem. The primary immediate problem is that of getting food supplies down there, the problem of shipping. We all know there is a shortage of ships; every available ship is needed for war purposes, but I believe that in an emergency where people face starvation exceptions should be made. For instance, if the people on the Rock of Gibraltar were faced with a similar situation I am certain that Parliament or the British Prime Minister would not hesitate a moment to take over ships and rush foodstuffs to Gibralt-

tar to prevent what exists in Puerto Rico—food shortage, starvation, and widespread unemployment. This most deplorable and tragic situation in Puerto Rico requires a positive order directing the allocation of ships sufficient to rush needed foodstuffs, seeds, fertilizers, and medicines so urgently required down there. Secondly, we have got to control prices in Puerto Rico. As I understand it, O. P. A., in fixing a spread and in taking into consideration the cost of transportation and the price which has to be paid for the foodstuffs purchased in the States for Puerto Rico, cannot bring prices within the reach of the average consumer in Puerto Rico. We must resort to subsidies. The Department of the Interior has a fund of \$15,000,000 for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska, but the fund is being used scarcely at all for this purpose. The very first thing that is required is to direct the Agricultural Marketing Administration and the Department of the Interior to use the funds the departments have for the purpose of subsidizing so as to bring the prices down to a level within reach of the people of Puerto Rico.

Thus, we must first get the food there; second, we must get the prices down by subsidy and O. P. A. regulation; and third, these people must have money with which to buy—and they have none.

Now, if I may come back to the question of ships.

Puerto Rico comes under our coastwise shipping laws. Cuba has ships; according to the information I have, Santo Domingo has 5 ships and is building more. I believe ships can be made available from some of the South American countries. Under our coastwise shipping laws they cannot sail down our coast and bring foodstuffs to Puerto Rico and cargo back from Puerto Rico. So that what is necessary for the period of this emergency at least is this: The coastwise shipping laws must be suspended so as to permit the carrying of foodstuffs down to Puerto Rico. The present system of permits, providing for the picking up in Puerto Rico of suitable cargoes, is cumbersome and does not meet the time element of the crisis. Only a blanket lifting of the coastwise shipping laws, so that ships of other nations may drop and pick up any cargo in Puerto Rico to and from the United States will be of some help.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I observe the statements made by the gentleman about getting supplies into Puerto Rico, the scarcity there and the high prices. Perhaps the gentleman stated this, but I did not observe that he said anything about the amount of production in Puerto

Rico. It has a fertile soil. How is the production carrying on? Do they have ships there to carry their products away from there to other countries so they can receive a return?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. They have no ships whatsoever.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They are not furnished any?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. They have none and they are not furnished any except ships delivering no more than about 30,000 tons of foodstuffs per month in the place of over 100,000 tons delivered in normal times.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do they have products down there ready for shipment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish the gentleman would tell us something about that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The warehouses of Puerto Rico have tons and tons of sugar on hand, and there is plenty of rum. In fact, Puerto Rico's main tax revenue is from rum. If they could get the ships down there to bring food supplies to the island, these ships could bring back rum and they could bring back sugar.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What about cotton?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is no cotton to speak of down in Puerto Rico.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How about fruits?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. They have pineapples and other fruits rotting in the fields because they cannot be shipped. Incidentally, the development of a pineapple cannery in Puerto Rico would help cut down United States appropriations for Puerto Rico. Development of fisheries would be a substantial factor. There is also some coffee down in Puerto Rico which, incidentally, is the best coffee in the world. Tobacco was at one time very important in the list of Puerto Rico's exports.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If they could get their coffee, sugar, and fruits away from there to other countries, then they will have some money and we would not have to subsidize them?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is true only to a limited extent. Puerto Rico must have ships, price subsidies, and funds for a large work-relief program, for the development of native industries and for a land program of subsistence crops.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean, if they had ships.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Because of the gravity of the situation as it has developed, even if they had the ships we have got to subsidize these prices to bring them down. We have got to implement the funds of the Department of the Interior and other Government agencies to bring prices down within the reach of the purchasing power of the people of Puerto Rico. The island itself is doing its utmost. The other day the Legislature of Puerto Rico adjourned after having appropriated \$10,000,000 to deal with their unemployed, to give them some purchasing power. It passed one

of the steepest revenue bills in the history of the island. It adopted a Victory tax and it also provided that 70 percent of the revenue which is to be collected from taxation on rum is to go toward assisting the unemployed in Puerto Rico. But we know, the President knows, and every person who is familiar with the problem of Puerto Rico knows, and even if you are not familiar with it, if you will take the figures given to us by W. P. A. down in Puerto Rico, which show that as of September they had 240,000 unemployed, and it is estimated as of last week that the figure has reached 325,000, you must come to the conclusion that they certainly do need funds which must come from us. Puerto Rico's plight is not the fault of the Puerto Rican people. We are responsible for it, and we must accept our responsibility as a true democratic people. I do not like the use of the term "work relief," but I do not see what else you can give them at this time but work relief as an emergency measure by direct appropriation by the Congress of the United States. If Congress fails to do so, or until Congress acts, then I think, as a necessary war measure because of the vital military position of Puerto Rico to us, the President should exercise his power under the lend-lease war powers to use lend-lease funds to alleviate the suffering which now exists on the Gibraltar of the Caribbean. It is my most considered judgment that a minimum of \$50,000,000 is needed for immediate food relief, price subsidies, and for a land program for subsistence crops.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman has been giving a really interesting picture of the situation in Puerto Rico. As I understand it, they have tons and tons of products that could be sent into this country if they had the ships to move those products?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. In the meantime, instead of doing something about that, I understand that we are shipping into Puerto Rico some of the same products that they have down there for exportation to take care of our Army and our armed forces. Therefore, if some plan could be worked out to bring into this country their major product, sugar, which we are rationing in this country, and let the products of that country be furnished to our servicemen instead of shipping our own products down there, it would tend to relieve the situation?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it would help relieve the situation to some degree, but it would not solve the problem. Further, we have never permitted Puerto Rico to develop its own refineries and other essential industries.

Mr. FULMER. A contributing cause to the unemployment problem down there is the fact that they are unable to get rid of what they have already produced and cannot go ahead and produce more?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; only one contributing cause. There are other



causes; the most decisive is colonialism; but I do not want to enter into any controversy at this time when I am pleading for relief from starvation. I simply point out that the war has brought sharply to the attention of the world, particularly to the Puerto Rican and his 100,000,000 Latin-American brothers, the dismal failure of the policy of colonialism in Puerto Rico.

Mr. FULMER. The shipping in and out of that country under some program and putting the people to work down there, or else giving them work somewhere else where they are needed, are two important things?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman has offered some very valuable suggestions. Our War and Navy Departments have not availed themselves of the opportunity to make direct purchases in Puerto Rico. May I say that I tried to get the War Department to purchase Puerto Rican coffee for the armed forces.

Mr. FULMER. The trouble with that, may I say to the gentleman, is that they are hell-bent on doing some of those things that will cost more money. For instance, when they took the Japs away from California they had been used to buying products from the small packers. As they were interned, the products that were bought for them had to be Federally inspected and had to be brought miles and miles from the large packers instead of using the packers in that community. That is the same thing as exists with reference to shipping into Puerto Rico products that could be utilized in Puerto Rico without transportation down there from here.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is no question in my mind but what the armed forces could use some of the products that Puerto Rico now has on hand or else are rotting in the fields or kept in the warehouses. Some time ago, I placed in the RECORD copies of correspondence between me and Government departments in which I implored them to make direct purchases in Puerto Rico.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not true that they have established some kind of a pooling arrangement down there for the buying of food for Puerto Rico?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is responsible for some of the trouble.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is this \$15,000,000 which is to be used for Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. A very small, insignificant amount has been used for the purpose of subsidizing prices, bringing prices down; in other words, subsidizing the seller so as to bring the prices down to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. GWYNNE. I have heard this criticism, and I wish the gentleman would discuss it, that the pooling arrangement down there has resulted in breaking up the normal channels of trade and has in itself reduced the flow of food.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is an incorrect statement. The situation must

be considered very realistically. It is a question of having ships. Our coastwise shipping laws prevent us from using whatever ships that may be secured from places like Cuba, Argentina, and Santo Domingo for trade between Puerto Rico and the United States.

The lifting of the coastwise shipping laws would be a great help in that direction. But then you have to come down to the problem of what the people are going to buy these foodstuffs with. You may alleviate that unemployment problem only to a limited extent by the sale of whatever foodstuffs Puerto Rico now has, but experience has shown us that that does not solve to any considerable extent the rock-bottom number of unemployed in Puerto Rico. This problem and its causes I shall discuss some other time. Today you have no longer that rock-bottom number, you have 325,000 unemployed, affecting 160,000 families.

What are we going to do about it? What are our Latin-American brothers and cousins going to think of us? Are we going to permit Puerto Rico to be really the Gibraltar of the Caribbean, or permit Puerto Rico to continue to be an Ireland for us, or shall it become a Singapore and a Burma? That is the real question. I submit that in the interest of winning the war either Congress or the President or both must act boldly and must act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein a report on food prices in Puerto Rico, prepared by S. L. Descartes, of the Office of Statistics in Puerto Rico. In examining these prices I ask you to bear in mind that 325,000 out of a total population of about 1,884,000 people in Puerto Rico are unemployed and have no income. The average annual wage of Puerto Rican workers when employed is a little over \$200:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
OFFICE OF STATISTICS,  
La Fortaleza, October 22, 1942.

RETAIL FOOD PRICES IN PUERTO RICO CONTINUE  
TO INCREASE RAPIDLY  
(By S. L. Descartes)

The index of the retail cost of foodstuffs in Puerto Rico increased to 196 on October 14, compared to 189 on September 15, 1942, or 3.7 percent. The rate of increase rose again after having declined to 2.2 percent from August 18 to September 15.

The index of imported foodstuffs declined from 224 to 219, or 2.2 percent from September 15 to October 14, 1942, but the index of locally produced foodstuffs increased from 156 to 171, or 9.6 percent during the same period.

Of all food groups, there were declines in prices only in beans, of 8.5 percent; and in fats and oils, of 2.9 percent. Tomatoes increased 41.5 percent; starchy vegetables, 22.2 percent; eggs, 16.5 percent; and dairy products, 1.3 percent.

The decline in beans was due to a drop from \$0.12 to \$0.10 in the price per pound of imported pink beans, which are the ones that are consumed in largest quantities in Puerto Rico. But locally produced white beans rose from \$0.134 to \$0.14 a pound, and locally produced red beans from \$0.12 to \$0.14 a pound. The greatest increase in starchy vegetables was that of taniers which rose from \$0.05 to \$0.07; sweetpotatoes rose from \$0.03 to \$0.35 a pound; and plantains from \$0.025 to \$0.03 per unit. Milk sold through stores declined from \$0.185 to \$0.177

a quart, but delivered milk rose from \$0.16 to \$0.18 a quart. Pork fat backs declined from \$0.20 to \$0.18 a pound; tomatoes of local varieties increased from \$0.12 to \$0.17 a pound; and eggs sold for \$0.07 each compared to \$0.06 each on September 15.

During this period in which prices are increasing so rapidly, sometimes from one day to another, it is desirable to emphasize that prices on which this index is based refer exclusively to October 13 for locally produced foodstuffs, and to October 14 for foodstuffs sold through groceries. The prices of some foodstuffs have considerably increased since October 14.

Neither should it be expected that the prices paid by each family for each foodstuff be the same as the price used in the construction of this index. Some groceries and locally produced foodstuffs stores sell at higher prices than others. In the construction of this index are used either the model or the average price of a number of groceries in the city of San Juan, and a number of locally produced foodstuffs stores in the Rio Piedras market, visited by the investigators of the insular department of agriculture.

Locally produced foodstuffs are sold at lower prices in the stores located in the Rio Piedras market than in San Juan or Santurce. For that reason, persons living in these localities pay more for eggs and starchy vegetables than the prices used in the preparation of this index. This fact does not affect the usefulness of the index, because the index shows the changes in prices, since when the price in San Juan increases, it is because the price in the Rio Piedras market has already increased. When eggs are sold in Rio Piedras for \$0.06 each, in San Juan and Santurce they are usually sold for \$0.07; when in Rio Piedras they rise to \$0.07, in San Juan they sell for \$0.08. Both the San Juan and the Rio Piedras price series may be used to present the trend of prices provided the same one is used continuously. The town or area to which the series refers should be stated, and this has been done in the case of this index, in the footnotes to the tables.

Prices in other cities of the island may vary somewhat from those in Rio Piedras and in San Juan. However, as Rio Piedras is the most important market for minor crops, and as San Juan and neighboring areas comprise the largest concentration of urban population, they undoubtedly constitute the best localities for the construction of this index. It is acknowledged, however, that sometimes there may be pronounced increases in the prices of certain foodstuffs in some places far away from distributing centers, on account of the internal transportation situation, and these increases may not be portrayed by this index. Probably the prices of some foodstuffs have increased more in rural areas than in San Juan.

This index is constructed on the basis of average food consumption in Puerto Rico, including both the rich and the poor. In the United States, these indexes are almost always based on the consumption of the laboring classes. In Puerto Rico it was impossible to do this last November, when the computation of the index was begun, because there were no facts on the consumption of the laboring classes. Thus far the increases in the prices of foodstuffs consumed in larger quantities by the poorer classes have been higher than those of foodstuffs more commonly used by the middle classes and the well-to-do. Therefore this index does not present fully the magnitude of the rise in the cost of the diet of the poorer classes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain tables.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. **ELIOT** of Massachusetts, for November 12, on account of death in family.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **DELANEY**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, November 18, 1942, at 10 a. m., to consider H. J. Res. 345 and H. R. 5764, H. R. 6858, H. R. 7550, H. R. 7709, and H. R. 7746.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. **HARRIS** of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6486. A bill for the relief of I. Arthur Kramer and Georgene Kramer, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. **HARRIS** of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Tomney; with amendment (Rept. No. 2628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. **LELAND M. FORD**:

H. R. 7778. A bill for the relief of Cecil Ray Murphy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. **KLEBERG**:

H. R. 7779. A bill for the relief of Luther C. Nanny; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. **MANSFIELD**:

H. R. 7780. A bill for the relief of O. M. Minatree; to the Committee on Claims.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1942

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they find the rest of Thy peace. Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free, free from prejudice and pride, from narrow nationalism and racial hatreds, and from all the ugly sins that do so easily beset us. Lift us above

the mud and scum of mere things into the holiness of Thy beauty, so that the trivial round and the common tasks may be edged with crimson and gold. In times of crisis and alarm, as we offer our very lives for the preservation of all the precious things we hold nearest our hearts, give us courage, give us vision, give us wisdom, that we fail not man nor Thee. Lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. **BARKLEY**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 12, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### AUGUST 1942 REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering operations of the Corporation for the month of August 1942, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PETITION

Mr. **CAPPER** presented a petition of members of the Lydia Bible Class of the First Baptist Church, Manhattan, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO THE FRENCH PEOPLE

Mr. **BARKLEY**. Mr. President, on Monday last an English translation of the President's message of November 8, 1942, to the French people was published in the **RECORD**. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the **RECORD** the message of the President as it was delivered in the French language to the people of France on that date.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the **RECORD**, as follows:

Mes amis, mes amis qui souffrent jour et nuit sous le joug accablant des Nazis, je vous parle comme celui qui en 1918 était en France avec votre armée et votre marine. J'ai conservé toute ma vie une amitié profonde pour le peuple français, le peuple français entier. Je retiens et je garde soigneusement l'amitié de centaines d'amis français en France et dehors de la France. Je connais vos fermes, vos villages, vos villes. Je connais vos soldats, vos professeurs, vos ouvriers. Je sais bien combien est précieux au peuple français l'héritage de vos foyers, de votre culture, et des principes de la démocratie en France. Je salue encore et affirme encore et encore ma foi dans la liberté, dans l'égalité et dans la fraternité. Il n'existe pas deux nations plus unies par les liens de l'histoire et de l'amitié mutuelle que le peuple de la France et des Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

Les Américains, avec l'aide des Nations Unies, font tout ce qu'ils peuvent pour établir un avenir sur, aussi bien que pour la restitution des idéals de liberté et de la démocratie pour tous ceux qui ont vécu sous le tricolore. Nous arrivons parmi vous à repousser les envahisseurs cruels qui voudraient vous dépouiller pour toujours du droit de vous gouverner vous-mêmes, vous priver du droit d'adorer Dieu comme vous voulez et de vous arracher le droit de mener vos vies en paix et en sécurité. Nous arrivons parmi vous seulement pour écraser et pour anéantir vos ennemis. Croyez-nous bien, nous ne voulons vous faire aucun mal. Nous vous assurons, une fois que la menace de l'Allemagne et de l'Italie est éloignée de vous, nous quitterons votre territoire immédiatement. J'appelle à votre réalisme, à votre propre intérêt et aux idéals nationaux français. N'encombrez pas, je vous prie, ce grand dessin. Rendez-nous concours ou vous pouvez, mes amis, et nous verrons revenir les jours glorieux ou la liberté et la paix régneront de nouveau dans le monde.

Vive la France éternelle!

Vive la France éternelle!

#### GENERAL PERSHING'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **DAVIS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the **RECORD** as a part of my remarks a brief article published in the Washington Post of today which contains a letter addressed to the President of the United States by that great and distinguished general, John J. Pershing. The letter extends a dramatic invitation to his former comrades in arms in France to form their battalions again and join the Allied march past Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel, and Verdun to victory at Berlin. That they will make that march no one now questions.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the **RECORD**, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of November 13, 1942]

#### THE AXIS HAS MET ITS MARNE—PERSHING ASKS HIS COMRADES IN FRANCE TO JOIN ALLIED MARCH

Gen. John J. Pershing last night issued a dramatic invitation to "my former comrades in arms" in France to "form their battalions" again and join the Allied march "past Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel, and Verdun to victory at Berlin."

"The Axis has met its Marne," the aging commander of the American Expeditionary Force assured his French colleagues in the 1918 victory over Germany. The enemies who inflicted the horrors of a new war on the world have reached "the high-water mark of their conquest" and are now "in recession," he said.

General Pershing's declarations were made in a letter to President Roosevelt, only a day after he had stood with the Chief Executive at Arlington and paid tribute to one of his men of 1917 and 1918, the Unknown Soldier.

The general wrote:

"Yesterday I was privileged to stand by your side at Arlington before the tomb of an American soldier of 1918 who gave his life to arrest the course of German barbarism. I tried to imagine what his response would be to your promise that the enemy which he confronted again will be beaten and the dream of a better world for which he died surely will be realized. As you spoke, 24 years seemed to roll back, with the consequence that, as his Commander in Chief, I dare attempt in all humility to say to you today the words which he cannot say.

"I am certain with you that our enemies who have visited all the horrors of a new war on the civilized world face final, inevitable defeat, that the high-water mark of their conquest has been reached, and that they are in recession. I am positive with you that the peoples whom they brutalized and the territories which they ravaged will, in the days